

JK

674

I 35





Class JK674

Book I35

PRESENTED BY

Indiana Civil Service Reform Association.

DOCUMENT No. 1.

REPORT OF THE SUB-COMMITTEE APPOINTED BY THE EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE OF THE INDIANA CIVIL SERVICE REFORM ASSOCIATION, TO EXAMINE INTO THE CIVIL SERVICE OF THE BENEVOLENT INSTITUTIONS OF INDIANA.

To the Executive Committee of the Indiana Civil Service Reform Association :

GENTLEMEN—Up to the present time your Committee has been able to examine into the condition of the Civil Service in only one of our benevolent institutions, viz.: The Indiana Hospital for the Insane.

This institution is the seventh largest in the world. It contains 1,566 patients, and employs 336 persons. The estimated value of its real and personal property is \$1,615,447.34, and the amount appropriated for maintenance, repairs, etc., of the past year, was \$347,500. The general control and management of the Hospital is intrusted to a board of three trustees, who have authority to appoint a Superintendent and such other officers as may be needed. The President of the Insane Hospital Board is also the presiding officer and third Trustee of the Blind Asylum and Deaf and Dumb Asylum Boards. The incumbent trustees of the Insane Hospital are Thomas H. Harrison (President of the Board), P. M. Gapen and B. H. Burrell. The Superintendent is William B. Fletcher, M. D.

THE SPOILS SYSTEM.

The act under which this Hospital is operated is political in its character, and the management of it has been conducted upon the political or spoils system. No examination is held to ascertain the fitness of persons appointed to service therein. Democrats only receive appointments. Places are given for political reasons. Legislative influence is courted by

the appointment of many relatives and friends of Democratic members of the General Assembly, especially in the Senate. Senators Green Smith, Faulkner, Howard, McClure, Hilligass, Bell, Duncan, Bailey, Fowler, and many others, have had one or more relatives and friends thus chosen. Senator Faulkner alone secured the appointment of a daughter, nephew, three neices and a number of attendants. Letters are written by direction of the Board to various members of the Legislature, asking them to send some one to the asylum for appointment. Boone county, the residence of Dr. Harrison, sends nineteen employes to the asylum, while about one-half the counties are not represented at all. The traffic in place has been reduced to a system, and is carried on to such an extent as to become a public scandal. Had the Trustees, at the time of their appointment, entered into a corrupt bargain with the members of the Legislature for their positions, the reciprocation of favors could not have been more cordial and enduring than it is. While some of the appointees are worthy and competent, many of them have been wholly unfit for the positions for which they were selected; and a number of them have been found so grossly incompetent, that they have been obliged to leave. Even for the technical and responsible position of physician, men are thus chosen without special qualifications or previous experience to fit them for the place. Many of these employes are active political workers. Subscriptions are circulated among them, and funds raised for campaign and other political purposes. Money has been thus raised to prosecute the Democratic campaign in Boone county, where Dr. Harrison, President of the Board, resides. The politics of Wayne township, Marion county, is largely controlled by the employes of the hospital in the matter of selecting delegates to Democratic conventions. A number of employes of the institution were recently delegates at such a convention. An active agitation was maintained among the employes of the institution in respect to the recent Bynum and Bailey controversy. On the day of the first Democratic Congressional Convention, the hospital was almost deserted by the employes and the attendants. One or more of them have been candidates for Democratic nomination for political office, and have been vigorously canvassing in their own behalf while in the service of the hospital; for example: M. F. Kelly, a night attendant and candidate for Representative. Additional places have been made for political workers. M. L. Stansbury, formerly book and store-keeper, had politicians foisted upon him as assistants, until it took three men to do the work previously performed by a single assistant. As an instance of the political qualifications necessary for appointment, it may be stated that when one Mr. Gibson applied for regular employment at the asylum, Mr. Gapen, one of the Trustees, found fault with him, and said that he did not vote the straight Democratic ticket. Mr. Gibson then got parties to certify that he was a Democrat. Most of those who furnish the bulk of supplies to the asylum appear to be Democrats, and a number of them are prominent politicians in that party. For example: Hon. Franklin Landers and J. J. Cooper, Treasurer of State, sell hogs to the asylum, and John E. Sullivan, candidate for Clerk of Marion County, is the most successful bidder.

The results are such as might be expected from such a system—(1), careless and unbusiness-like methods pervading the entire organization from the Board of Trustees down, with (2) much favoritism, corruption and inefficiency, and (3) constantly recurring cases of neglect and cruelty toward the unfortunate inmates of the hospital. Let us particularize: An inspection of the minutes of the Board, made in July last, disclosed the fact that P. M. Gapen, one of the Trustees, had been present at only one meeting since Octo-

Gift

Association

FEB 28 1916

ber, 1885. He is said to be managing a saw-mill in Arkansas. An allowance of \$150, for salary, made to him at the meeting of July 8th, 1886, would not indicate that his compensation as Trustee had been reduced in consequence of his absence. The law requires the Trustees to adopt a code of by-laws and regulations for the management of the hospital. The Board entered upon its duties in February, 1883, yet in August, 1885, it was necessary for the Superintendent to remind them, in his monthly report that they had forgotten to comply with this law, and that it was impossible to manage the hospital without such regulations. Even after this report, no by-laws were adopted until January, 1886, nearly three years after the organization of the Board. The minutes further disclose the fact that a great number of changes among the employes of the hospital are being continually ordered by the Board of Trustees. For instance: At the meeting of June 3d, 1885, the discharge of eleven employes was ordered; in September, 1885, three more; in October, 1885, fourteen more, etc. On December 1st, 1885, Dr. Fletcher, Superintendent, reports:

"I was not able to make all the changes provided by you at the October meeting. To have done so would have been injurious to the hospital. I have, therefore, reduced the help gradually until the desired change should be accomplished."

Yet in January, 1886, further changes were made. These discharges appear to be for the purpose of making room for other applicants. Superintendent Fletcher, in another report, says:

"There are a large number of persons demanding places in the hospital, and, if any changes are desired by the Board, I hope they will be made at this meeting, and that a rule be adopted that may stand as an answer to all future applicants, that no change will be made except for violation of rules or incompetency."

Of the 336 attendants and other employes of the asylum, more than four-fifths have been changed during the three years of the present administration.

The minutes of the Board also disclose a great deal of discord among the Trustees themselves regarding these changes, as well as in other respects. The Board proposed to remove Mr. Stansbury, book and store-keeper, and the latter resigned October 26th, 1883. Dr. Tarleton opposed the acceptance of the resignation, but it was accepted, and Dr. Tarleton thereupon resigned as Treasurer of the Board. It may be inferred from a statement made by Dr. Tarleton, that the removal of Captain Stansbury was the result of a conspiracy. Dr. Tarleton said that soot or ashes (another informant says lamp-black), was put into the butter by some one in order to prove that Captain Stansbury was incompetent for his position, in that he accepted adulterated or spoiled supplies. At any rate, the appointment of J. S. Hall, as book and store-keeper, was confirmed, Dr. Tarleton voting in the negative.

The minutes also disclose many disagreements in reference to the allowance of claims against the Asylum. Thus, at the meeting in October, 1885, four different claims were allowed in spite of Mr. Gapen's opposition.

THE CONTRACT SYSTEM.

The system under which contracts are let is defective in many particulars. Your committee were informed by Mr. Burrell, one of the Trustees, that in the matter of stationery they had to make a requisition upon the State Board of Printing, at prices higher than the same stationery could be procured in the market. He gave as an instance some writing pads which he showed us,

which cost sixty cents at the State Board of Printing, and which could be procured from Cathcart & Cleland for forty cents. The present law in relation to the State Board of Printing seems to be the cause of this difficulty.

Mr. Burrell further stated that the system of purchasing was not as cheap as could be devised. It would be easy for the dealers in any particular line to combine on prices. There were usually only three bidders in the dry goods trade and they could easily combine if they wanted to. He thought the asylum would do better if it could buy outside of the State.

The system upon which bids are let appears to be very defective in another respect. The book and store-keeper, Mr. Hall, makes out, each month, an estimate of the different articles which will be needed for the asylum, specifying each particular article and the probable amount of each required. All the items of any particular class of goods, such as groceries, provisions, dry goods, etc., are embraced in one requisition, and these requisitions are hung up in the rooms of the Supreme Court from six to ten days before the bids are made. The bids are opened the last Friday of each month. A separate estimate is made upon each article and the total is footed up. The contract is then awarded to the bidder whose *total* is the lowest upon *all* the goods of his particular class. But the contract provides that the bidder shall furnish the articles named in his requisition, "more or less," at the prices specified, and the asylum can require more, or accept less of any given article than the amount named in the requisition. Mr. Burrell told us that the footings were often erroneous; he thought sometimes intentionally so, for the purpose of securing the contract, but that the board usually corrected these errors before awarding the contract. But apart from this, it is evident that under such a system the contract might easily be given, not to the lowest, but to the highest bidder, if the book-keeper, who prepares the estimate, should act in collusion with the bidder. The amount required of some articles might be under estimated and others over estimated, and by apportioning a higher price to the under estimated articles and a lower price to the others, the total bid would be lower, while as to the goods, which are actually required, the price would be considerably higher. Mr. Hall, the book and store-keeper, further informed us that there were some instances in which the contracts were not, in fact, given to the lowest bidder, on account of differences in the character of the goods, etc. So that the awarding of contracts is a matter resting almost entirely in the discretion of the board, and upon the good faith of the book and store-keeper, and his assistants, who compare the articles furnished with the requisitions and samples, so far as this is done at all. From Mr. Hall we also learned that frequently a successful bidder sends word that he can not carry out his contract, and then Mr. Hall fills the gap by making purchases without calling for competition, as the law requires.

Another feature of the contract system involves, as it seems to us, such extravagance as to imperatively demand remedial legislation, if, indeed, anything more is required than the interpretation of a doubtful statute. Instead of combining the requisitions for supplies made by the several Superintendents of the Insane Hospital, Deaf and Dumb Asylum and the Blind Asylum, and advertising for bids on the supplies in bulk, the supplies for each institution are bought separately, and, therefore, more dearly; and yet the bids are opened at the same time, in the same room and by the same persons. Nominally, there are three meetings—one by each board, respectively; practically, there is only one. It generally happens that bids on articles which are used in common by these institutions, such as meats, groceries, dry goods, etc., differ considerably.

Again, although the Superintendent nominally approves the estimates

and requisitions, audits the accounts and formerly signed the vouchers, it appears that this is merely a perfunctory act upon his part. In his report for July, 1885, the Superintendent "protests against the absurd formality, which is neither required by law nor morality, of signing vouchers as being correct of which he can not have any knowledge."

In his report for November, 1885, he says:

"I would ask the board to define my relation to the department of hospital supplies. Besides the matter of making monthly estimates, has the Superintendent any authority, after the Board has made contracts,, to order the rejection of any of the goods for any cause? By what law is the Superintendent compelled to sign vouchers as being correct when he can not know, neither having made the contracts nor having inspected the goods?"

After this date, Hall inspected the vouchers.

JOHN E. SULLIVAN.

These expressions led your Committee to inquire whether there might not be some improprieties in the making of contracts or the acceptance of goods, for which the Superintendent was unwilling to be responsible. An examination of the minutes of the Board revealed some matters in relation to supplies which your Committee consider very remarkable. They show that in regard to certain lines of goods of which the hospital requires supplies regularly every month, such as produce, groceries, dry goods, etc., a certain few among the bidders seem to have been pretty constantly successful. Thus, in the matter of produce, most of the contracts appear to have been awarded to one John E. Sullivan, and the minutes show that his claims for the following amounts were allowed by the Board upon the following dates respectively:

May 10, 1883	\$ 587 87	February 10, 1885	\$1,336 42
July 5, 1883	1,078 54	March 5, 1885	1,129 68
August 31, 1883	1,044 42	April 9, 1885	1,544 28
October 4, 1883	843 65	June 3, 1885	957 20
October 31, 1883	1,013 59	July 3, 1885	1,138 84
December, 1883	1,658 15	September 14, 1885	1,479 53
January 10, 1884	364 80	October 20, 1885	167 25
February 7, 1884	1,037 59	December 1, 1885	1,645 47
May 8, 1884	985 16	January 7, 1886	1,415 25
June 5, 1884	910 08	February 4, 1886	1,234 40
October 31, 1884	1,426 64	March 4, 1886	158 16
December 4, 1884	2,048 52	July 8, 1886	738 79
January 8, 1885	476 25		

The claim of \$476.25, allowed January 8th, 1885, had been presented to a former Board of Trustees, consisting of John Fishback, B. F. Spann and R. H. Tarleton, at a meeting held May 4th, 1882, and disallowed by that Board, as shown by the following extract from the minutes:

"The amount claimed by J. E. Sullivan, included a charge for 3,175 lbs. of butter, which, upon investigation, the Board believes to be oleomargarine or some other kind of manufactured butter instead of that required by the contract. The Board allowed the claim after deducting fifteen cents per pound, as shown by Voucher No. 254, of this date."

After his claim was disallowed, Mr. John E. Sullivan made open political war upon Mr. Fishback, and the other members of the Board. He lobbied actively in the corridors of the Legislature for the passage of the Brown

Bill, which was to legislate his enemies out, and, after its passage, gave a dinner to his friends in honor of the event. Then Mr. Sullivan presented his rejected claim to the new Board, and the claim was paid by them, although more than eighteen months had elapsed since it had been disallowed by the old Board, under whose management the supplies were furnished.

Your Committee are informed that, at one time, Sullivan bid upon butter and did not furnish it, and refused to furnish it when called upon so to do. That the store-keeper, Captain Stansbury, went into the market and bought it at a higher rate, charging Sullivan the difference. That Harrison forbade Stansbury to charge this difference to Sullivan, but that Tarleton insisted, and the charge was sustained. Mr. Sullivan is an influential political supporter of Dr. Harrison.

Mr. Arthur Jordan, a large dealer in wholesale produce, and a competing bidder, says:

“The first instance that I recollect in which, being the lowest bidder, I was not awarded the contract, was early in the Harrison management. The claim was made that I had not put in any samples of the butter to be furnished. I know we were the lowest bidders—for I was told so by the steward, Capt. Stansbury—but that our bid was rejected because we had no samples of the butter to be furnished. Previous to that time no samples had been required.

The next month I submitted samples, although no other samples were exhibited there except mine; still the contract was given again to J. E. Sullivan. I was told that I was the lowest bidder. The butter was rejected because one tub, in their judgment, was a little too salty. At all events, the contract was given to Mr. Sullivan for that month. His bid was submitted for good butter, according to the requisition, and so was mine, and our bids on that grade were very close together. There were other bidders, I think. But that month they threw out both of our bids on good butter, and awarded him a contract for creamery butter at 25 cents a pound. The requisition was for country butter, and they gave him the contract. I think my bid for country butter that month was for 10 cents a pound. I do not know whether there were other bids than mine. They did not let the contract for any kind of butter that month, but bought the creamery butter of Sullivan at 25 cents a pound. Then the newspapers got hold of that in connection with some other things, and Hines wrote up the whole matter in the *Journal*. Those articles came out just before the letting of the contracts of the next month, and on that occasion they gave me a contract for that month. In that month I do not know whether I was the lower bidder. But they did not call on me for any butter until between the 10th and 15th of the next month. In the meantime Sullivan furnished butter up to that time in my month, at 25 cents a pound, and he put in 10-cent country butter at 25 cents a pound.

Q. Will you please state how you know that?

A. I had not furnished a contract for them, and so I went out to the asylum with the first load to see if everything was satisfactory. I asked them to let me see some of Sullivan's butter. The steward, Mr. Hall, told me they had not any of Sullivan's butter left, and that they had used it up clean. So I waited awhile for the driver and them to weigh the butter. While waiting there, some one drove up with some beef, and they opened the cellar to put it in. I stepped inside, and found a tub full of butter with “fancy butter” printed on the tubs. I asked them if they had not overlooked that. I asked the store-room man there—this man Roth. He said he did not know it was there. I asked him to let me look at it, to see what kind of grade butter it was. So we opened one of the tubs, and I tried it with the tryer. I found it a very common kind of country butter, which at that time, I think, could be bought at 6 and 8 cents a pound, and he was furnishing it at 25 cents a pound as creamery butter. That same plan was carried out afterwards very frequently. In the letting of bids the contract would be let for creamery butter,

and at the extreme market price, and the contract would be filled with country butter; but of course no responsible bidder, that was bound to furnish what he had agreed to furnish, could put in this cheaper grade of butter. Therefore, necessarily he could not compete against that kind of bids.

Q. State some other instances of that kind, if you know any?

A. That is the only instance of which I have any definite knowledge. But I know by examination of butter at various times, by seeing loads that were booked to go to the Insane Asylum, and by seeing these tubs, that Sullivan was not putting in creamery butter, although the contract had been distinctly let for creamery butter. But that only continued through the summer months. When winter came he had some other expedient, and he began to put in butterine, purchased at Chicago. I saw the butterine at the asylum. I could tell it was furnished by him because I knew he had the contract for that month. I knew they were the same tubs, because I had seen them pass by my store from the depot and hauled to his store, and afterwards delivered to the Insane Asylum. The matter went so far that Hall stated to me that they had been receiving butterine, and Hall said he did not care whether it was butterine or butter, so long as they did not kick in the wards. The consequence was we could not get any contract unless we would take it at a price at which we would be compelled to put in a very inferior grade of poor butter, and the risk to any one, except the initiated, was so great that no one would care to take a contract on those terms.

Q. How long has he furnished butterine in that way?

A. The first time that I know, of my own knowledge, that butterine was furnished, at least that he began to put it in regularly on the regular contract, was early this last winter. That is as far back as I can recollect.

Q. How do you know it was butterine?

A. I had seen these tubs, and had seen them out there. There is considerable difference in the appearance of tubs of butterine and butter. Further, the butterine is put up in an attractive style, while creamery butter is not. The Chicago price of creamery butter being 30 cents per pound, and knowing that the Chicago price controls the market here, we know that creamery butter can not be sold at 22 cents, but that butterine can be sold at the latter price. I have had occasion to examine the butterine in the tubs. I am an expert, and know it to be butterine.

Sullivan is not the only man that has put that in. There is a man at Columbia City who has had three or four contracts in the last year. He put in butterine that came direct from Chicago here on those contracts. One month this man from Columbia City ran short, and they came around and bought some butter of me. I showed them some butterine also, and Hall said: "I guess I know what that is, we have used that out there." I then said to him, "Why don't you come out like a man and put in your requisitions for butterine," and he said, "You know that would not do, because the newspapers would get hold of it and blow us up on it." Sullivan has been frequently permitted to remain in the room while they were letting the bids. I know of his being in there several times. He remained in there after they had locked the door."

The Superintendent's Report for May, 1885, contains the following:

"In relation to the purchase of produce at the last Friday in April, I objected to both bids, as it was far above the highest retail price. This can be seen by referring to the bids of Budd and Sullivan. I asked as a favor that neither bid be accepted, as I desired to save from \$200 to \$300 for investments in amusements and ward decorations for the patients. To this I understood the President to agree, and he told Mr. Sullivan that we had so determined. I then took bids and closed with Howard Duffy, Columbus, Ind., at *nearly one-half less than the lowest bid offered*. Thus far the eggs and poultry have been better than any ever used in the hospital since we

have been here, and the butter was not mixed and gave about the same satisfaction as the best creamery, so called, that we paid 28 cents for.

"Now comes John Sullivan and says that he has got the contract for the produce, and is ordered to deliver the same. I, having no such directions from the Board of Trustees, have refused to recognize Mr. Sullivan's demands. I now wish to know the will of the Board, and will gladly acknowledge my error and correct the same. I respectfully suggest that if economy and quality are objects worth considering in this Institution, that the Board authorize the Steward or the Superintendent, or go themselves twice a week and purchase by selection and bids all vegetables, fruit, butter, and eggs. It is in this way only that we can insure good and fresh materials at the most reasonable rates."

In point of fact, Sullivan got the contract and the pay for the butter at his own price.

An examination of the books reveals that in the month of May, 1885, in which Mr. Sullivan had the contract for furnishing butter to the hospital, at twenty-six cents a pound, butter had been purchased, in small quantities, of Robinson, at twenty-five cents, and also in large quantities from Howard Duffy, of Columbus, at sixteen cents. Your committee inquired of Mr. Hall, the book and store keeper, as to the butter furnished, and were informed that there had been some trouble in the butter contract, and that Mr. Hall had had the butter examined by Mr. Hurty, the chemist; that some of it was found to be pure and some of it was found to contain lard and other ingredients; that these ingredients appeared in the butter furnished by Mr. Sullivan, as well as in that furnished by other parties. Your committee visited the asylum in July, when the butter was furnished by one Krouse, of Columbia City, and inquired of Mr. Roth, assistant store-keeper, and Mr. Burrell, one of the trustees, whether any of the butterine had been left over from the June supplies, for the purpose of testing and examining it themselves, but were told by Mr. Roth that none of it was left. It seems, however, that on that very morning, butter, infested with maggots, had been concealed in the sewer beneath the store-room, to avoid the inspection of your committee. The butter (or butterine) had been furnished in June, by John E. Sullivan, and had been accepted. The reports of subsistence, made to the Superintendent and quoted hereafter, also show that the butter served in June was frequently of very poor quality, but your committee were unable to find any deductions made in the claims of Mr. Sullivan, for butter, on account of furnishing an inferior article. Mr. Gibson, who was an assistant book-keeper prior to April, 1884, frequently saw the butter furnished by Sullivan, and states that it was oleomargarine. The instance of Mr. Sullivan is only one among many similar cases.

OTHER PROSPEROUS BIDDERS.

Another prosperous bidder is the firm of D. P. Erwin & Co., formerly Johnson & Erwin. Out of twenty-four bills of goods sold by this firm to the asylum, which were examined by your Committee, eighteen bills bore the statement that they had been sold by one Goulding. Your Committee learn that this Mr. Goulding is a son-in-law of P. M. Gapen, one of the Trustees. The concurrent action of Mr. Goulding's employment by this firm, and of Mr. Gapen's presence upon the Board seem to have given a strong impetus to the success of the firm in furnishing supplies to the asylum.

Another business house which was remarkably successful in under-bidding competitors was that of Mr. Kreitlein, afterwards Kreitlein & Schrader. Mr. Gibson, who was one of the store-keepers in the institution for about a year, says that Kreitlein furnished a large number of articles for

the asylum which did not correspond with the specifications at all, and were of greatly inferior quality. The witness saw barrels of apples where the top of the barrel contained apples of one kind, and the bottom apples of another kind, altogether inferior and different.

“Dr. Fletcher directed these apples to be returned, but Kreitlein sent them back to the asylum, and they were afterwards accepted by Hall, the steward, and by Gapen, one of the Trustees. Nearly all that Kreitlein sent was in very bad condition. Goods were received over Dr. Fletcher’s condemnation again and again. They were simply sent there and left. He would make complaints nearly every month, but they were not heeded. Gapen and Harrison accepted the goods over the protest of Tarleton, the other Trustee. Kreitlein’s rice was inferior. It was not the rice which was bid for. His prunes were very bad, and his coffee was bad.”

Dr. Tarleton, formerly one of the Trustees, states that he often protested against the acceptance of hospital supplies which did not conform to contract. Many other irregularities were shown.

J. Francis Burt, of the Brooks Oil Co., 60 South Pennsylvania street, stated that upon two separate occasions the Brooks Oil Co. had bid for a certain quality of oil for the Indiana Hospital for the Insane, and that the contract had been let to other parties, and that in each instance another and inferior quality of oil had been furnished, and not the one required in the specifications. That they were unable to get the contract for the use of their own oil. He knew of an instance where a kind of grease was bid for which was worth fifty cents and on that specification another was furnished and accepted which was worth fifteen cents.

Mr. Gibson also confirms the above. It seems, however, that in one of the above cases the inferior oil was not paid for.

Christian Schrader, on South Pennsylvania street, says that upon a bid and specification for Lexington Mustard, worth thirty cents, Durham Mustard was furnished, worth about eighteen cents. That he examined the mustard, and also examined the specification, and hence knows this. That this Durham Mustard was accepted by Hall.

J. S. HALL.

The Hospital for the Insane purchases about \$20 000 worth of supplies every month. These pass through the hands of Mr. Hall. His qualifications for the important position which he holds, that gives him practical control of the supply department, are thus stated in a protest filed by Dr. Tarleton with the Board of Trustees, and appearing upon the minutes:

“It became my duty some months ago to protest against the appointment of J. S. Hall as book and store-keeper of this institution. Believing that my experience in hospital matters gave me a fair knowledge of what the necessary qualifications should be to fit a person for so important a position as book and store-keeper; and believing that the said Mr. Hall was entirely unqualified for said place, I opposed his appointment in every honorable way I knew how, but the majority ruled, and he was appointed. I have more feeling in this appointment than upon any of the other acts of the Board in which I have been in the minority, some of which instances I have had an opportunity to talk about and vote upon, whilst others were settled in my absence, and I was allowed to acquiesce or fruitlessly object to. As I have always been in attendance on all regular or called meetings, I feel that I have not shown a disposition to shirk responsibility, and now, believing more fully than ever, that the said Mr. Hall is not qualified for the place, it becomes my duty to enter my protest at this time against the further retention of the said J. S. Hall as book-keeper, and ask that he be requested to resign within ten days, for the following reasons:

1. As book-keeper he does not keep the books, but others keep them for him. Some of the books and records are imperfect and mutilated; besides, we have been paying others to do the work he should have done.

2. As storekeeper he does not receive and inspect the goods purchased in but very few instances during the month, and can not properly judge of them when he does receive them, which fact of not being present, and inability to compare the goods with the samples when present, renders it necessary to employ and pay others to do the work he should have done, all of which is against economy and good management.

3. That he is supercilious, and arrogates to himself authority that does not belong to him, which leads to mismanagement and bad government, such as misstatements in regard to the sanitary condition of the hospital; assuming the power to employ and discharge and fix wages, and to purchase goods without authority. He has spoken in a manner unbecoming an officer, of his superiors other than the Superintendent, to an extent absolutely insubordinate.

4. That his carelessness of disposing of the castaway property does not increase the earnings account as it should.

Now, gentlemen, if you think you can afford, and are determined to submit to, the retention of Mr. Hall, after so long a trial and positive proof of his inability, I must again protest. Incompetency leads to extravagance and useless expenditure of the funds entrusted to us by a more than generous public. I appeal to you, gentlemen, in the name of a Democratic Board of Trustees, to join with me in the matter, which if not corrected at once must lead to disaster to the management.

Respectfully submitted,

R. H. TARLETON."

Dr. R. H. Tarleton voted to put the above protest into effect, and Dr. Harrison and P. M. Gapen objected.

From many facts reported to your committee, it appears to us that the foregoing protest of Dr. Tarleton had a strong basis of fact and was dictated by an earnest desire for the welfare of the hospital. Dr. Tarleton, however, soon ceased to be a member of the Board of Trustees. After the foregoing statements, it seems to us almost unnecessary to say that Mr. Hall is an active political worker and is said to have rendered important services in the passage of the Brown Bill.

A MISSING DISCOUNT.

Before leaving the subject of contracts and hospital supplies, your committee are compelled to note an unexplained irregularity. In 1883 the hospital advertised for bids on upholsterer's hair. Your committee are informed that the bids were received but set aside, and that P. M. Gapen, Trustee, and W. B. Fletcher, Superintendent, were authorized to make the purchase; that a contract was closed with Mellen & Co., of New York, for \$2,590.75; and that there was to be a discount or drawback of 2½ per cent. for cash in thirty days. Your committee are further informed that the goods were delivered and accepted, and paid for within thirty days. It seems, however, that the discount or drawback was not accounted for. More than one year afterwards Samuel A. Brokaw, Secretary for the Superintendent, wrote to Mellen & Co. for an explanation. The following letter was received in reply:

NEW YORK, March 2d, 1885.

Samuel A. Brokaw, Secretary, Indiana Hospital for the Insane, Indianapolis, Ind.:

Dear Sir—In reply to your letter of the 26th ult, we state that on the 10th of January, 1884, we sent you a check payable to the order of the Indiana Hospital for the Insane for \$64.77, for a discount on a bill that you had settled for at about that time, and had overlooked the matter of discount. The check was paid and endorsed by "P. M. Gapen, Treas." We remain, very truly, MELLEN & CO.

Your Committee regret to say that an examination of the books of the Treasurer of State and of the reports of the Asylum, fails to show that Mr. Gapen has accounted for this money.

In response to inquiries addressed to Mr. Gapen, who is in Fort Smith, Arkansas, Mr. Gapen said he did not remember the transaction, was sure it was accounted for, and would look it up when he returned to Indiana next month (October).

EXTRAVAGANCE OF THE BOARD.

The management of the Asylum reveals extravagance and waste in many ways.

In his report for March, 1885, Dr. Fletcher says:

"A special question is: Shall the Superintendent have power to make out estimates for materials that are required for the management and maintenance of the hospital, or not? Some very clear definitions upon this matter would be a great relief. For example, in February the Board, upon requisition, had purchased a number of curtains, *these being without rings* or means of attachment. The latter articles were applied for on the second estimate and *promptly marked out by the Trustees*. Without the means of attachment the curtains are of no value."

"Two dozen lounges had been estimated for by the supervisors and approved by the Superintendent, because such lounges were required by the wards, a large number of the former settees having been destroyed by the fire. These, although so much needed by patients who are feeble and obliged to sit up all day upon hard chairs, were likewise promptly erased."

In another of his reports to the board, the Superintendent states:

"The amount of bread wasted of the kind we make is wasted on the wards at the rate of 2,688 pounds per month. This fact is from actual weighing made during the past week. The bread purchased after the fire was of uniform kind, much relished by the patients, and showed almost no waste."

Much of the leakage appears to be due to the failure of the Trustees to give the matter personal supervision. Superintendent Fletcher indicates this in the following, which is also taken from one of his reports to the Board.

"I consider the head of the laundry, outside of the engineer and store-keepers, the most responsible position, and where more money can be lost or saved than in any other in the institution, and I wish the Board would *give some personal attention to the matter at this meeting*, otherwise we will be compelled to return to the old plan of six employes to do what three would do better."

For some of this waste the employes seem to be responsible. Dr. Fletcher reports April 1, 1885:

"The entire ironing for 750 patients is now accomplished in two days, whereas it requires three and one-half days to iron the clothing for about 150 employes."

A mere perusal of the minutes of the Board shows much carelessness in the manner in which they are kept; many of them are so full of erasures, interlineations and other mistakes as to justify the belief that such negligence would most likely extend to more important matters in the management of the Asylum. This seems to be the case. Your Committee visited the carpenter shop and engine room adjoining. The engine is run at a cost of about fifty dollars a month, and the power is almost entirely wasted. In the shop your Committee found absolutely nothing doing; the wheels were running at full speed, but the place was empty. In a back shed were two men, one of whom was mending a lock. Five carpenters are employed to perform the work that could be done by two.

Mr. J. H. Hoffman, formerly a carpenter at the institution, states that while he was finishing the store-house after the recent fire, Mr. Burrell, one of the Trustees, sent to him, for employment, three carpenters from Jackson county, with a letter. They were to be paid \$2.50 a day and boarded, which Mr. Hoffman said was more than any such mechanics got in this State. This was granted by the Board and paid. Mr. Hoffman protested that the men were overpaid, and said they were not first-class mechanics. That he could get the very best workmen from the city of Indianapolis for \$2.25 a day, and who would board themselves. Harrison sent two men from Lebanon. The Board discharged four men without notifying Hoffman, including a good mechanic whom he had brought from Martinsville. The Board alleged as a reason for the discharge, "lack of work and scarcity of funds." Hoffman told them that that was not true, and resigned. Dr. Fletcher refused to accept his resignation, but he insisted that it be sent by Dr. Fletcher to the Board, who thereupon accepted it. A man from Lebanon was put in his place, whom he knew to be incompetent. Hoffman left the asylum in June, 1885.

The case of Brice Martin is another instance of favoritism. He has a monopoly of selling cigars and tobacco in the hospital grounds and pays nothing for the privilege. Light, heat and room are furnished to him free. In addition, he draws a salary as a porter, but the patients perform most of his work. His wife is also in the employ of the asylum. Martin's yearly revenue is said to nearly equal that of the Superintendent.

On September 14, 1885, the Board reduced the wages of Mr. Roth, assistant store-keeper, from \$75 to \$60 he to board himself and vacate his room at the hospital. In the meeting of October an effort was made by one of the Trustees to suspend the order of reducing wages, and in February, 1886, to restore the wages to \$75, but it failed. While your Committee were unable to ascertain all the facts leading to this reduction of wages, they believe that a thorough investigation by somebody with power to compel the production of evidence, would establish its connection with the examination and non-acceptance of supplies.

The result of these irregularities has been such as to inspire widespread distrust of the methods of the hospital among the business men of Indianapolis, and to keep many of them from submitting bids at all. A considerable number of the best firms in the city refuse to have anything to do with contracts for the asylum. Among others, Byram, Cornelius & Co., and Henry Schwinge & Co., refrain from bidding on this account.

Mr. O'Connor, of M. O'Connor & Co., wholesale dealers in groceries, on South Meridian street, states that they stopped bidding some time ago, because they found that there were certain pets at the asylum who got all the contracts, and that there was no fair competition. We therefore believe that the fact that there are so few bidders, referred to by Mr. Burrell as one of the causes of extravagance, is in part due to the acts of the Trustees themselves. The Board have undoubtedly made efforts to keep down the expenses of the asylum, and have succeeded in measurably reducing the cost of maintenance per capita, but we feel sure that this has been done by means which has impaired the efficiency of the hospital.

CHARACTER OF THE FOOD.

Naturally, the character of the subsistence furnished to the patients under such an administration is poor. Mr. Thayer, who had been an inmate of the asylum for a short time, says:

“For supper at one time the attendant put on a plate of hog meat that was just hog fat, with the hair sticking out of the rind. It was vile pork. When that meat was put on the table I called the attendant’s attention to it; he simply picked up the meat and put it away, and appeared to feel himself that it was not fit to eat.”

It may be well to state in this connection that between December 9, 1884, and July 30, 1885, 14,213 pounds of dead hogs were sold by the asylum for fertilizing purposes. Most of these hogs died soon after they were purchased by the Board. How much diseased pork finds its way to the tables of the patients it is impossible to say, since the annual report contains only the record of the hogs which were so badly diseased that they died before the time of killing arrived, and were sold. There is no doubt that a great deal of diseased meat has been consumed as food. Of over 600 hogs purchased more than half died. One lot were apparently “death-stricken” when delivered at the hospital. They began to die rapidly, and at the same time slaughtering went on for the tables. It was neck-and-neck between disease and the butcher’s knife.

Another evidence of the character of the articles furnished, appears in the daily reports of subsistence, made by the officer of the day to the Superintendent. Your committee examined only the reports during the first twelve days of July, 1886, and the reports of the Women’s Department for June. They contain the following statements:

June 3. Meat tainted. Coffee not good.

June —. Some complaint of quality and preparation of meat. (It seems they have always boiled beef instead of roast.)

June 13. Tea very weak. Butter not good.

June 16. Butter not fit to use.

June 19. Butter not good. Coffee for breakfast very weak. Subsistence otherwise moderately good.

June 22. Not enough meat for breakfast. Cabbage for dinner and apple sauce for supper not well cooked.

June 25. Not enough potatoes for dinner and not enough milk for supper.

June 28. Some complaint about the coffee.

In July, Men’s Department.—

July 12. Butter in south dining room reported very bad.

July 8. Women’s Department. Butter strong.

July 12. Butter strong. Bread sour.

The use of butterine has been already referred to. The quality of the meat and molasses is said frequently to be bad.

CRUELTY TO PATIENTS.

The character of the attendants procured by this political system of management is so low that acts of neglect and cruelty toward patients seem to be frequent.

Mrs. A. C. Anglemeyer states the following circumstance, which she saw during a visit made to the Asylum last May:

“As we got out of the car and were going around to Dr. Fletcher’s office, there was a girl there that seemed to have done something—we did not see the start of it. From what we saw we thought she wanted to get into the hammock. She was walking with the rest of the patients, and some one slapped her severely; it must have been eight or ten times in the face. It was the attendant, I suppose—I am almost sure it was the attendant—and then she shook her severely several times. Of course we were not very close to her. She put her hands up in this manner (indi-

cating), and she seemed to be very much hurt. The lady that was with me reported it to Dr. Fletcher."

Mr. R. A. Merithew had a son who was a patient at the hospital, where he frequently visited. He says:

"On one occasion, in the rear of the men's hospital, I saw the patients of one of the wards together, and saw a man run along the line on his hands and knees. Another young man came up by him and kicked him severely in the side several times. I was then talking to one of the attendants, and called his attention to this, and asked him if the man who kicked the other was one of the attendants. He said "no," that the man who did the kicking was not an attendant, but was one of the patients. I asked the attendant whether a man, who was standing by and looking upon this scene, was an attendant, and he said that he was. This man made no effort to restrain or prevent the kicking, and never moved. He stayed there for some time. The man who did the kicking afterwards lifted the patient whom he kicked up by the neck, dragged him back to the seat and set him down violently upon it. The attendants still did not interfere. I reported it to Dr. Thomas."

Mr. Albert Thayer, who was also a patient for a short time, states that it was the custom to strike and slap patients for infringing the rules, and that when a patient misbehaved the attendants would threaten to send him to the back wards among the dangerous lunatics. Sometimes these attendants would spend their time in teasing the patients. He gives the following instance:

"There was a patient there that was fond of speaking of his honesty, and his attendants appeared to be fond of teasing him about it. When they were out walking two different times they treated him something after this manner: When they are walking they have resting stops; and when they would be sitting down one of the attendants would get in front of him and the other behind him, and one of them would grab his hat and then slip it around to the other attendant and then tell the patient 'you stole that hat.' They would keep this up for some time, and the patient, when they accused him of stealing the hat, would say 'it is not so; I am an honest man.'

Q. "The design was to irritate him and make fun of him?"

A. "Yes, sir. And he was an old man—a fine looking old man. While they were doing that the other patients were not allowed to talk.

Mr. Thayer also speaks of a man who had the epilepsy, and was subject to ill treatment.

Q. "Who was the attendant?"

A. "Cressenger and some of the convalescent patients themselves.

Q. "Did any of the convalescent patients treat the man who was ill with epilepsy badly?"

A. "Yes, sir; they struck him, slapped him and kicked him.

Q. "Was the attendant present at the time?"

A. "Yes, sir.

Q. "Did he interfere?"

A. "No, sir.

Q. "Was the patient ill with epilepsy in the ward when you left?"

A. He was sent to another ward before I left. My attendant gave me to understand he would be sent to a ward where he would be made to behave himself.

There was a patient there, whose name I don't remember, at this time. They found it necessary to clean his finger-nails, and Cressinger took hold of him to clean

them, when he showed a disposition to refuse to have them cleaned. Cressinger then got one or two of the other patients to assist him in holding him. I helped to hold the patient myself, and during the operation Cressinger struck the patient a couple of times with his fist. The nails were always in a good condition, and there was no necessity for such force as that. That was in Ward C, and occurred about the first of July, two years ago."

The almost painful silence preserved by the patients in many of the wards, while due in part to the nature of their malady, is also due in a measure to the forcible and repressive treatment practiced on them by the attendants. Patients are governed more through fear than affection.

Recently in one of the back wards of the men's department, a patient who had secreted a knife about his person, was deprived of it, and was then wantonly and brutally kicked by the attendant. The Superintendent happening in immediately after the affray, instantly discharged the attendant. But only sporadic cases of cruelty come to light. The attendants combine together, and rarely, if ever, betray the misdeeds of one another to the authorities.

The need of reform in the character of attendants is apparent to Dr. Fletcher, as appears from a letter written by him to Mr. Thayer, containing the following:

INDIANA HOSPITAL FOR THE INSANE, }
INDIANAPOLIS, OCT. 3D, 1884. }

Albert Thayer:

Dear Sir—Your communication of the 22d received. I have no doubt of your motives regarding reforms in this institution. They are the highest and purest. Neither do I doubt the necessity of the reforms you mention."

The following is also contained in one of Dr. Fletcher's letters to the Board:

"Owing to the large number of complaints of cruelty from attendants at the department for men, and the difficulty of finding persons of sufficient ability and the proper age, with the requisite amount of nerve, I have determined to introduce the system of having upon each ward a man and wife."

Dr. Fletcher has already introduced this system in some of the wards, and it is said, with admirable results.

THE REMEDY.

Many other matters have been brought to our attention, showing the poor character of the officers and employes chosen by the political methods which we have described—cases of drunkenness, neglect of duty, and notorious immorality, which have brought great scandal upon the hospital. We do not think that any useful purpose will be subserved by entering into the nauseating details of these things, at the present time, especially since most of the parties involved in them, so far as appears, are no longer connected with the hospital. We think, however, that the condition of the hospital is such as to require a rigid, searching investigation, by some body that possesses the power to compel the production of evidence. Our own inquiries have been much curtailed by the refusal, of various persons connected with the hospital, to disclose facts known to them, and by statements made to us confidentially, which we are not at liberty to insert in this report.

In his report for March, 1885, Superintendent Fletcher says:

"I would ask you to establish one rule at once: Never to keep in the pay of the hospital a person who is useless, and under no circumstances to part with one

who is valuable. It should be managed on the same principle that the head of a family would manage their own domestic affairs. A servant that is not a good one is not only useless but injurious."

In his report to the Board, April, 1885, he proposes the following plan to secure a higher degree of efficiency among the attendants at the hospital:

"I would suggest that in an institution so large, a regular system of teaching and training of attendants should be required previous to being put upon the payroll. That no one be permitted to continue such a course who does not intend to follow insane hospital work as a vocation. They should wear a uniform when on duty. They should serve three months without pay; three months at \$12.00; three months at \$15.00; three months at \$20.00; the second year \$22.00, and each subsequent year an addition of \$1.00 per month. In this way we would have a reserve at all times of about twelve. And all persons graduating from the hospital course should pay back all expenses in case they took private employment as special nurses or entered other hospitals within a year. A similar course to this is pursued at McLain Hospital, Boston, Mass., and also works admirably in the City Hospital here and elsewhere."

The mismanagement of the asylum—a peculiarly great evil, considering the character of the Institution—lies in that abominable system by which the welfare of the unfortunate beings for whom the benevolence was created, is made a secondary consideration to some supposed party advantage or political necessity, and no permanent improvement can be looked for while this continues to be the case.

The obvious remedy for abuses connected with this Institution is the enactment of a law by the General Assembly providing for competitive tests of fitness, to be applied to all persons seeking employment in the Asylum, followed by a suitable probation, prohibiting appointments or removals for political reasons, and placing the administration of this Hospital, as well as the other benevolent institutions of this State, in the hands of non-partisan Boards of Trustees. We would also recommend that the position of Trustee of the Insane Hospital should not be accompanied with any salary. In most of the States such office is purely honorary, and is filled by a much better class of men than in Indiana. And we recommend that the Civil Service Reform Association of Indiana call the above facts to the attention of the people of the State, in order that members may be elected to the next General Assembly who will bring about this much-needed reform. We further advise that a copy of the foregoing report be forwarded to the Governor of the State for such action or recommendation to the next General Assembly as shall seem suitable to him. And we further suggest that at the next session of the General Assembly, a petition be presented by our Association asking a thorough investigation of the management of the Hospital, at an early period in the session, so as to determine the nature and extent of proper reformatory legislation.

WILLIAM D. FOULKE,
OLIVER T. MORTON,
LOUIS HOWLAND.

INDIANAPOLIS, IND., Sept. 10, 1886.

[Read and approved by the Executive Committee of the Indiana Civil Service Reform Association, and ordered to be printed.]

JK 674
I 35
202307
MAR 10 1880

Indiana Civil Service Reform Association.

DOCUMENT No. 2.

A REPORT RELATING TO THE FEDERAL CIVIL SERVICE IN INDIANA SINCE MARCH 4, 1885.

To the Executive Committee of the Indiana Civil Service Reform Association :

GENTLEMEN—I lay before you the results of an investigation begun in April last relating to the Federal Civil Service in Indiana since March 4, 1885. The information has been drawn from Republican, Democratic and Independent sources. Care has been taken to check and verify, and while some errors of detail may have been made, I believe this report presents a truthful general view since the date named.

The country is trying to work its way out of the spoils system, and the end may or may not be a long way off. Progress depends almost exclusively upon the Administration for the time being. As the Constitution now stands, if we are to be freed from the spoils system it must be done by the President, who derives his ample power not from any statute, but from the Constitution itself. It is not a question of how much a President can do, but of how much he will do. A statesman in that position could, if he willed, shatter that system beyond recuperation. The people, however, can not compel the President. We elect him upon the best promises we can secure, and then live in the hope that he will keep those promises. The promises, then, of Mr. Cleveland are first to be examined, and a knowledge of them is necessary to determine what under the circumstances is reasonably to be expected. That only can be regarded as failure which disappoints such expectation.

In his first annual message as Governor of New York Mr. Cleveland said: "It is submitted that the appointment of subordinates in the several State departments, and *their tenure of office or employment should be based upon fitness or efficiency.*" After his election to the Presidency he wrote, in December, 1884: "I regard myself pledged to this [the fair and honest enforcement of the Pendleton

act] because my conception of true Democratic faith and public duty requires that this * * * should be, in good faith and without evasion, enforced, and because in many utterances made prior to my election as President, approved by the party to which I belong, and which I have no disposition to disclaim, I have in effect promised the people that this should be done. * * *

"I know * * * that the spoils system has been supposed to be intimately related to success in the maintenance of party organization, and I am not sure that all those who profess to be the friends of this reform will stand firmly among its advocates when they find it obstructing their way to patronage and place. But fully appreciating the trust committed to my charge, no such consideration shall cause a relaxation on my part of an earnest effort to enforce this law.

"There is a class of government positions which are not within the letter of the civil service statute, but which are so disconnected with the policy of an administration that the removal therefrom of present incumbents, in my opinion, should not be made during the terms for which they were appointed solely on partisan grounds, and for the purpose of putting in their places those who are in political accord with the appointing power. But many now holding such positions have forfeited all just claims to retention because they have used their places for party purposes in disregard of their duty to the people, and because, instead of being decent public servants, they have proved themselves offensive partisans and unscrupulous manipulators of local party management. The lessons of the past should be unlearned, and such officials, as well as their successors, should be taught that efficiency, fitness and devotion to public duty are the conditions of their continuance in public place."

It is necessary to turn back and read over the "lessons of the past." The Constitution makes no provision for removals except on impeachment. It fixes no term for the great body of place holders. Of the power of removal left by implication in the President, James Madison said in June, 1789: "The danger then consists merely in this—the President can displace from office a man whose merits require that he should be continued in it. What will be the motives which the President can feel for such abuse of his power and the restraints that operate to prevent it? In the first place he will be impeachable by the House before the Senate for such an act of *mal-administration*; for I contend that the wanton removal of meritorious officers would subject him to impeachment and removal from his own high trust."

After he became President, Jefferson wrote, in March, 1801: "Of the thousands of officers, therefore, in the United States, a very few individuals only, probably not twenty, will be removed; and *they only for doing what they ought not to have done.*" And to another correspondent: " * * * But the great stumbling block will be removals, which, though made on those just principles only, on which *my predecessor ought to have removed the same persons, will nevertheless be ascribed to removal on party principles.*"

The fact has been often repeated, that for forty years, and under six Presidents, only seventy-three officers were removed. Those forty years are an unshaken witness that the makers of the Constitution understood that there could properly be no removals by the appointing power except for cause; and this extends to the meanest employe. Congress recognized this by passing, for partisan purposes, the act of 1820, which limited the term of certain officers to four years. There is, then, in the Constitution, no justification for "wanton" removal from place—removal for what has come to be known as "political reasons;" and such a removal is an act of arbitrary power belonging only to absolute rulers. Nevertheless, after John Quincy Adams followed a long period of mal-administration consisting in usurpation of this arbitrary power, and in the exercise of it to a greater extent than was practiced by the head of any other nation in the world. This is the "spoils system" referred to by the President, and this period furnishes the lessons of the past which are to be unlearned.

Foreseeing the possibility of the spoils system by reason of the act of 1820, Thomas H. Benton, in a report to the Senate in 1826, said: "The King of England is the fountain of honor; the President of the United States is the source of patronage. He presides over the entire system of federal appointments, jobs and contracts. * * * * We must look forward to the time * * * when the principle of public action will be open and avowed—the President wants my vote, and I want his patronage. I will vote as he wishes and he will give me the office I wish for. What will this be but the government of one man? And what is the government of one man but a monarchy?"

Under the stimulus of the act limiting certain terms to four years, the Executive appetite was whetted, and the Executive hand was soon well in. "Wanton" removals became the rule without regard to expiration of term, and breaking over all constitutional limits, the officers who held without term were swept out with the rest. One of the last protests was made by Mr. Calhoun, who in 1835 said:

"It is only within the last four years that removals from office have been introduced as a system, and for the first time an opportunity has been afforded of testing the tendency of the practice and witnessing the mighty increase which it has given to the force of Executive patronage, and the entire and fearful change, in conjunction with other causes, it is effecting in our political system. Nor will it require much reflection to perceive in what manner it contributes to increase so vastly the extent of Executive patronage. So long as the offices were considered as public trusts, to be conferred on the honest, the faithful and capable, for the common good, and not for the benefit or gain of the incumbent or his party, and so long as it was the practice of the government to continue in office those who faithfully performed their duties, its patronage, in point of fact was limited to the mere power of nominating to accidental vacancies or to newly created offices, and would, of course, exercise but a moderate influence either over the body of the community or over the office holders themselves; but when this practice was reversed—when offices, instead of being considered as public trusts, to be conferred on the deserving, were regarded as the spoils of victory, to be bestowed as rewards for partisan service—it is easy to see that the certain, direct and inevitable tendency of such a state of things is to convert the entire body of those in office into corrupt and supple instruments of power, and to raise up a host of hungry, greedy and subservient partisans, ready for every service, however base and corrupt. *Were a premium offered for the best means of extending to the utmost the power of patronage; to destroy the love of country, and to substitute a spirit of subserviency and man worship, to encourage vice and discourage virtue; and, in a word, to prepare for the subversion of liberty and the establishment of a despotism; no scheme more perfect could be devised, and such must be the tendency of the practice, with whatever intention adopted, or to whatever extent pursued.*"

In declaring that "efficiency, fitness and devotion to public duty" are the conditions of continuance in public place, President Cleveland, in the clearest manner, declared his intention to return to the constitutional course of the founders of the Constitution, and to the principle and example of the founders of his own party. He was not the first who proposed this return. Others had advocated it for nearly twenty years. The National Democratic platform of 1876 says:

"Reform is necessary in the civil service. Experience proves that efficient, economical conduct of the government business is not possible *if its civil service be subject to change at every election*, be a prize fought for at the ballot box, be a brief reward of party zeal, instead of posts of honor, *assigned for proved competency and held for fidelity in the public employ*; that the dispensing of patronage should neither be a tax upon the time of all our public men, nor the instrument of their ambition."

Samuel J. Tilden's letter of acceptance in 1876 says: "One (evil) is the prevalent and demoralizing notion that the public service exists not for the business and benefit of the whole people, but for the interest of the office holders, who are in truth but the servants of the people. * * * * The other evil is the organ-

ization of the official class into a body of political mercenaries, *governing the causes and dictating the nominations of their own party.*" And in that year Mr. Hendricks, in his letter of acceptance, said: "In the reform of our civil service I most heartily indorse that section of the platform which declares that the civil service ought not to be 'subject to change at every election,' and that it ought not to be made 'the brief reward of party zeal,' but ought to be 'awarded for proved competency and held for fidelity in the public employ.' I hope never again to see the cruel and remorseless proscription for political opinions which has disgraced the administration of the last eight years." And four years later the Democratic Convention reaffirmed the platform of 1876.

The Pendleton act, as a beginning of the reform, was the outcome of this and similar agitation fostered by civil service reform associations, in whose every constitution was the clause, "removals shall be made for legitimate cause only, such as dishonesty, negligence or inefficiency, but not for political opinion or refusal to render party service." Except in two cases this law did not in words attempt to deal with the power of removal. That power remained and still remains in the President; and this is practically true, even where Congress has vested certain appointments in the President's subordinates. In the light of the discussion that preceded the passage of the Pendleton act, and considering the object and method of that act, it can not be said that the President could execute that law in its spirit and intent and still exercise or allow others to exercise the power of removal without cause. If, for instance, a postmaster may, unmolested by the President, "wantonly," as Mr. Madison puts it, dismiss any man, then he may so dismiss all. And if among the four from whom he must choose to fill the vacancy he can not find a partisan, and is forced to take one not a partisan, he may the next moment dismiss this appointee and look among the next four for a partisan. This is mocking at reform. The spoils system would be honester. But as we have seen, the President included not only the places within this law, but the entire service within the principle of removal for cause only. With this fair promise in view I have pursued this investigation.

A definition by the Administration of the words "for cause" was foreshadowed in Mr. Cleveland's letter of December 25, 1884, and this was codified by Postmaster General Vilas in a circular dated April 29, 1885. This cause was offensive partisanship in an office holder, and Mr Vilas laid down the following specifications:

1. Having been an active editor or proprietor of a Republican newspaper printing offensive articles.
2. Having been a stump speaker.
3. Having been a member of a political committee.
4. Having been an officer of a campaign club.
5. Having been an organizer of political meetings.
6. Having made his office headquarters of political work.
7. Having put his clerks into the performance of political duties.
8. Possibly other acts of equal force.

The circular provided that proof of partisanship could be made by a Congressman's affirmation of knowledge, or by the affidavit of some person whom the Congressman could vouch for as of "unquestioned credibility," or by documentary evidence; offensive articles in newspapers were to be shown by slips.

The definitions and specifications are none too strict, the offenses enumerated should not be tolerated in any Federal place holder. Given a proper case for the application of the rule, there must, of course, always be one certain inseparable accompaniment, without which its enforcement could only be intolerable—the same measure applied to an offender must be applied to his successor, and this, too, from

the moment of appointment, not from the time of some special order to be issued in the future. And the President and the Postmaster-General in conversation freely declared their intention to apply the rule rigidly from the first moment to the new appointees. Mr. Vilas wrote, September 14, 1885: "I hope I shall ever be as willing to remove an unfit person when appointed by me as if he had been found in the service as I took it." This, also, I have had constantly in mind.

The Federal Civil Service in Indiana is mainly comprised of the postoffices, the railway mail service, the internal revenue service, the pension service, the customs service, the district attorney's office, the marshal's office, and the government depot at Jeffersonville. It falls into two divisions, the classified service entrance to which is open to all through competitive tests, and the unclassified service, entrance to which is restricted by arbitrary appointment. The Indianapolis postoffice only is in the classified service.

POSTOFFICES—FIRST CLASS.

The only office of this class is at Indianapolis. Aquilla Jones took charge of this office as postmaster at midnight, beginning April 19, 1885. Mr. Jones had for many years been a citizen of high standing in Indianapolis. Fifty years before he had been a postmaster under Andrew Jackson, and he held like positions under later Presidents. He found his office under a non-partisan law, based upon open competition. It was a critical moment for the new system. Many men would have regarded it an honor to be thus permitted to enforce a great reform act with honesty and impartiality under a cross-fire of hungry friends and bitter enemies. He found in the unclassified service one assistant postmaster and cashier, one stamp clerk, three heads of divisions, five male sack repairers, four female sack repairers, and one messenger; in the classified service thirty-one clerks and thirty-nine carriers, making a total of eighty-five employes.

CHANGES IN THE UNCLASSIFIED SERVICE.

On taking possession of his office Mr. Jones forthwith removed the assistant postmaster and cashier, the stamp clerk, the messenger and the superintendents of the registry department and of the carriers, and filled their places with Democrats. All of the dismissed officers were competent and efficient men, as was also the superintendent of the money order department, who was invited to remain a few weeks and who refused.

He appointed as assistant postmaster, John W. Dodd, an obscure and reduced politician. From a reform standpoint a worse selection could not have been made, and it startled even the politicians. He appointed as cashier, his son, Ben. Jones. It will be observed that Dodd and Ben. Jones were appointed in place of one man.

The other places, except the money order department, were filled by untried men. The superintendent of carriers had been a paperhanger and a politician. The superintendent of the registry department was nineteen years old, a nephew (by marriage) of Mr. Hendricks, and had been clerk in a drug store. The stamp clerk had been a minister, and his personal performance of his duties for a long time now appears like a practical joke on the public; but it was at the time a serious inconvenience. He has improved, but in the conduct of the business he is decidedly inferior to his predecessor. The dismissed stamp clerk, W. W. Welling, for fourteen years had been an employe beyond criticism. The following quotation from his affidavit shows the circumstances under which he was dismissed:

"W. W. Welling, being duly sworn, says that he is forty-five years old and is by occupation a farmer. That he served about three years in the eighth Indiana regiment and was wounded at the siege of Vicksburg and carried the bullet for nearly three years. That he was appointed railway mail agent in 1868, and after three years' service was appointed stamp clerk in the Indianapolis postoffice, which position he held until he was dismissed therefrom by Postmaster Jones, April 19, 1885. That about one week before Postmaster Jones took possession of the office, he came to the stamp window and said to affiant: "Mr. Welling, would you like to stay?" And affiant replied: "Of course, I should like to stay, Mr. Jones." That Jones then said, "Well, when Mr. Wildman gets through with you, you get a new bond and have it ready to present to me." That affiant prepared a new bond as requested. That he saw no more of said Jones until April 17, when said Jones brought Rev. O. H. P. Abbett into the stamp office and said: "Mr. Welling, when Mr. Wildman gets through with you, Mr. Abbett will take your place." That affiant then suggested that it would not be necessary to present the new bond, and said Jones replied that he guessed not. That affiant never asked said Jones to retain him."

In the sack repair department every man and woman was within a few weeks dismissed and was succeeded by a Democrat. The superintendent, G. F. McGinnis, was an ex-General of the army, and of high standing in the community. The new man was a meat inspector. He was the party boss of his ward, the henchman of a well known political clique, and in other respects was an unfit appointment. He draws \$100 a month salary and pays no attention to the duties of his place, but pursues his business of meat inspecting as before. Of the four women removed, one was a niece of the late General Burnside; one was a soldier's widow, with a widowed mother; one was a widow; one was unmarried, with a widowed mother. All had others dependent upon them for support. They did their work well and earned their wages. They were succeeded by three male ward politicians, but with no saving of pay to the government. It does not seem that there can be a claim of more work done by the three men, because the four women did all there was to do. The male employes discharged were efficient men: three, including the superintendent, were soldiers.

Soon after Mr. Jones became postmaster he was appointed custodian of the postoffice building. As such he controlled six employes—janitors, watchman, engineer and elevator boy; of these four were soldiers. He gave them time to put on their coats and hats and appointed Democrats in their places. As head janitor he appointed his son, Fred Jones. The dismissed head janitor had always done his share of the mopping and other janitorial work with his three subordinates, but his successor confined himself to superintendence, and as this took little of his time, he was put to it to find a place to stay where his leisure would not be exposed to the public. For many days he sat in the engine room in the basement. Later an elaborately furnished room up stairs was assigned to him, and he assumed the title of "assistant custodian." Later he secured a place as special examiner in the pension service. His successor has resumed janitorial work and has lost the title.

Referring to all of the foregoing removals, whether made as postmaster or custodian, Mr. Jones said: "I made such removals for no other reason than that the persons were Republicans."

PARTY WORK—UNCLASSIFIED SERVICE.

In view of the demonstrated attitude of the President, interpreted further by the circular of the Postmaster general as to causes for removal, and relying on the reasonable inference that new appointees everywhere would be held to the same

rule, I have investigated the conduct of many of them in different parts of the State to determine whether or not they were being guided by the rules laid down.

It is convenient to know that the last Indianapolis city election was held in September, 1885; the last township election, embracing Indianapolis, was held in March, 1886, each shortly preceded by primaries; the last Democratic congressional convention of the Indianapolis district was held May 27, 1886, and was called together again September 4 last; the last Democratic county convention was held July 17 1886, and having performed some of its duties adjourned to August 14, 1886, and the last Democratic State Convention was held August 11 last.

Of the foregoing appointees connected with the postoffice and the Federal building Postmaster Jones has taken part in a primary, Assistant Postmaster Dodd made a speech at a primary, and was deeply interested in defeating the re-nomination of Mr. Bynum for Congress; Cashier Ben Jones promised the postoffice against Mr. Bynum, but at the primary cast his vote for a Bynum delegate.

Stamp Clerk Abbett has attended a convention, and was vice-president of a political meeting September 27.

Joseph Sheppard, the head of the repair department, has been a busy and thrifty "worker," occupying a seat in the City Council. He controls the primaries of his ward; practically he is a primary. Any candidate seeking delegates must "see" him. He was prominent at the last city nominations. He made earnest efforts in the last convention for the nomination for county officers, and was closely occupied with the recent State convention, in which a candidate was astonished at seeing delegates promised to him by Sheppard voting for his adversary. September 27, he was vice-president of a political meeting.

John Van Stan, appointed in the repair department in place of a woman, has been in perpetual motion on behalf of his party. At the last city election he was a challenger; at the last township election he was a challenger and ticket peddler; at the last congressional primaries he was chairman of one until it split, and then was chairman of the anti Bynum section. He was at the congressional convention working against Bynum. He was a delegate to the last county convention, and again to the adjourned convention August 14, 1886.

Jacob Fox, appointed in the repair department, was at the polls working for Democratic candidates at the last city election.

Dennis Colbert, appointed in the repair department, continues to be a zealous ward worker. He was a delegate at the last city convention, also at the congressional convention as a Bynum man, and, as a reward, his brother has recently been appointed to the railway mail service.

THE CLASSIFIED SERVICE—REMOVALS.

The duties of the assistant postmaster and cashier under the previous administration had been performed by one man, at a salary of \$2,000. Dodd was put in as assistant postmaster at a salary of \$2,000, and Ben Jones was put in as cashier at \$1,500. To obtain the additional \$1,500, Mr. Jones, at the moment of entering his office, cut down the classified service by dismissing two distributing clerks, Wheat and Foster, who each received \$1,000 a year. Mr. Jones and his son, Ben Jones, and Dodd, among them, do the same work formerly easily done by Postmaster Wildman and assistant postmaster Thompson. Yet \$1,500 more is

paid. The distributing force was and still remains cut down, to the inconvenience of the public. Needed men were without cause deprived of their positions in the classified service, in order to put upon the pay-roll, in the unclassified service, the postmaster's son, and a man who apparently had some irresistible claim to "recognition".

I quote from Wheat's affidavit:

"James C. Wheat, being sworn, says that he is forty-three years old, that he is a clerk. That he served two years and seven months as first sergeant in the forty-ninth Indiana regiment, and was wounded in service. That he was appointed distributing clerk in the Indianapolis postoffice in 1876, and while in that position he never stood below ninety-seven on examination, and had a small per cent. of errors in work. That three or four days before Postmaster Jones took charge he heard that he was to be dismissed, because said Jones wanted to make places for his son Ben and J. W. Dodd, but had not money enough from Thompson's salary to pay them, and would apply affiant's salary to that purpose. That he met said Jones the day before he took charge, and, telling him what he had heard, he asked said Jones not to dismiss him, but to give him a chance to resign, and Jones said he would do so. That said Jones took charge the next night at midnight, and the following morning this affiant received his written dismissal, to take effect at once. That he then went to said Jones and reminded him of his promise to give him a chance to resign, and Jones replied: 'I've got nothing to do with it. Go and see Dodd,' and this ended the interview."

The wanton dismissal of Foster was one of peculiar hardship. I quote from his affidavit:

"Wallace Foster, being sworn, says that he is forty-nine years old and was a clerk, but is not now in any employment. That he served nearly three years in the eleventh and thirteenth Indiana regiments. That he is entirely deaf by reason of exposure while in the service. That he held the rank of lieutenant the first three months and captain the balance of the service. That he was appointed clerk in the Indianapolis postoffice in 1881, and was dismissed therefrom by Postmaster Jones, April 19, 1885. That during the last three years of his service in the postoffice he was distributing clerk. That the first he heard of his dismissal was on Sunday, April 19, when he went to his work at the postoffice, said Jones having taken possession at twelve o'clock the night before. Affiant was then handed a written notice of that date, saying that his services were no longer required. That his deafness began in 1862, when he became entirely deaf in one ear, but that his hearing in both ears was not entirely destroyed until after two years' service in the postoffice."

"We hereby certify that Wallace Foster's honesty, integrity and faithfulness are unquestionable, and were during his term of service in the Indianapolis postoffice. That while his efficiency on account of his infirmity was not of the highest degree, yet it was not so impaired but that he was a fair average clerk.

"J. A. WILDMAN, late Postmaster at Indianapolis.

"E. P. THOMPSON, late Ass't. Postmaster at Indianapolis.

"R. P. CRAFT, late Supt. Carriers at Indianapolis."

The Pendleton act was passed January 16, 1883. The following table includes all examinations under that law for places in this postoffice:

June 25, 1883.	9 applied.	3 passed.
August 22, 1883.	11 applied.	9 passed.
June 12, 1884.	18 applied.	15 passed.
February 28, 1885.	25 applied.	24 passed.
June 10, 1885.	165 applied.	131 passed.
June 15, 1886.	45 applied.	32 passed.

This table shows that an examination was held less than two months before Mr. Jones became postmaster. His predecessor had made few appointments from

the list of those last examined there was, therefore, on hand, a large list of eligibles for vacancies that could honestly occur.

I am free to charge that Mr. Jones has never intended to honestly enforce the law, but he has bent every energy toward working Republican incumbents out of their places and putting his partisans into the vacancies, and that he has grossly and deliberately violated the Pendleton act. The facts which follow sustain this serious charge :

From the list of eligibles in existence when he became postmaster, Mr. Jones has made but one appointment, Bates, a Democrat. Bearing upon his intention, I quote from the following affidavits :

" Charles W. Riggs being sworn says that he is forty-six years old, and is by trade a stoneware potter. That he served three years and one month in the thirty-sixth Indiana regiment. That he was examined for admission to the Civil Service at Indianapolis in February, 1885, and attained a standing of 78.15. That about a week after Aquilla Jones became postmaster affiant called upon said Jones and told him that he had passed the Civil Service examination, and had come to see if there was any prospect of any appointment as carrier. That said Jones in reply immediately said : "*Who did you vote for at the last election ?*" That affiant answered : "I don't know that you have any right to ask that question ; I don't know that it is any of your business." That said Jones then said, "What's your business?" to which affiant answered that he was then driving a bread wagon and said Jones then said, "You had better stay where you are. *There won't be any more appointments until after there is another examination.*"

" Henry C. Green being sworn says that he is forty-three years old, and is by profession a school teacher. That he served three years and ten months in the fifty-second Indiana regiment. That he passed the examination for admission to the Civil Service at Indianapolis in February, 1885, attaining a standing of 90 per cent. That after Aquilla Jones became postmaster at Indianapolis the affiant, believing that he was near the head of the list, called upon said Jones to learn the prospect of an appointment. That said Jones informed him that no appointments or removals would be made until July. That this affiant having in mind the change of administration, asked said Jones *if any Republicans would be appointed by him, and said Jones, after some hesitation, answered 'No.'* That this conversation occurred sometime in May, 1885."

The Civil Service Commission in the meantime, on the recommendation of Mr. Jones, appointed John W. Dodd, the assistant postmaster, to be the head of the local examining board ; the selection of Mr. Simeon Coy, of Indianapolis, Mr. Michael McDonald, of Chicago, and Mr. Michael J. Dady, of New York, to like positions in their respective postoffices, would have been analogous appointments, so far as concerns the civil service law. Associated with him were Mr. Morgan, the new superintendent of the registry department, and D. W. Elliott, a Republican member of the former board.

The examination Mr. Jones was looking for was held June 10, 1885, and 131 passed, from which list Mr. Jones has since made all of his appointments, 42 in number. Other than Wheat and Foster, no removals had so far been made. Being now ready, Mr. Jones entered zealously upon the work of making the classified service in his office a part of his party machine, dismissing his first group July 1. Every act made his intention plainer, as shown by the following :

" Willis G. Wood, being sworn, says that he is twenty years old, and is a graduate of the Indianapolis High School, and is now a book-keeper in the Indiana National Bank of Indianapolis. That he was examined for admission to the civil service in June, 1883, and attained a standing of —, being one of three who^s passed the first civil-service examination held at Indianapolis. That he was appointed clerk in the money-order department of the Indianapolis postoffice in July

of said year, and was dismissed therefrom June 30, 1885, by Postmaster Jones. That, on being dismissed, he requested and received from said Jones the following :

“ JUNE 30, 1885.

“ To whom it may concern :

“ This is to certify that there is no dissatisfaction with the manner in which Willis G. Wood has discharged his duties in the money-order department of the Indianapolis postoffice during my administration. “ AQUILLA JONES, P. M.”

“ That later he gave as his reason for having dismissed affiant, that affiant had made an increase of salary a condition of remaining. That this statement was false; that affiant's salary was increased without his solicitation, or knowledge, or expectation. That he afterward understood that it was done at the suggestion of David W. Elliott, because affiant's work had been largely increased by the changes in the money-order department. That when said Jones gave affiant the above certificate, he said *that he had no objection to this affiant personally, but that he had promised the place to another, and so he had to let affiant go.*”

“ Oscar N. Wilmington, being sworn, says that he forty years old, and is a carpenter. That he served four years in the fifty-seventh Indiana regiment, three years as an enlisted man and the fourth as first lieutenant. That he was appointed registry clerk in the Indianapolis postoffice in July, 1881, and was dismissed therefrom June 30, 1885. That he worked thirteen hours a day, Sunday and all. That on the day Postmaster Jones took charge of the office this affiant saw Ben Jones, the cashier, and a son of the postmaster, and said to him : ‘ I came into this office without solicitation on my part, and I don't want to be kicked out of it. When you want my place, if you will let me know, I will vacate it ;’ and he answered : ‘ Oh, yes ; you'll all have plenty of notice.’ That on the same day affiant walked up from the Union depot with Assistant Postmaster Dodd, and gathered from his talk about changes, that all the old employes were to be changed except David Elliott, and this affiant then conveyed to said Dodd the same wish to be allowed to resign instead of being dismissed, and said Dodd gave affiant to understand that his wish would be respected. That the conversation with Dodd occurred immediately before that with said Ben Jones. That the next affiant heard of his leaving the service was on the evening of June 29, when he received from Postmaster Jones a written dismissal, to take effect the following day. That on the evening of June 30, affiant, not understanding why he was dismissed instead of being allowed to resign, went to Postmaster Jones and asked him what he had done that he had been dismissed ; and told him that if he had done anything, either before or since said Jones became postmaster to deserve dismissal, he wanted to know what it was ; and said Jones said there was nothing. That affiant then said : ‘ *I suppose, then, you dismissed me because you wanted my place for some one else ?*’ To which said Jones replied, “ *Yes, I suppose so.*” That, in passing out of the postoffice building, this affiant was called by said Ben Jones, who, in the course the conversation, stated that the reason of affiant's dismissal was that his place was wanted for a Democrat.”

“ Louis Howland and Lucius B. Swift being sworn, say that they are attorneys at law in the city of Indianapolis. That on July 2, 1885, they called upon Aquilla Jones, postmaster of said city, and gave him their names, and told him they were members of the Independent organization in Indiana, to which he answered, “ I know who you are.” That they then called his attention to the fact that he had on the day before dismissed five men from the classified service and had appointed others, and that affiants were interested in the execution of the Civil Service Law, and had come in to get information, and in answer to questions said Jones said : ‘ Some of the men removed are inefficient, not all of them. There were charges against some of them, but not all. There were no charges against Wilmington. I liked him personally. He was a good man. *He did his work.* There were no charges against Wood. I liked him, too ; he was a good man. These men were Republicans. They were not of our faith, and I changed them because I had promised the places to Democrats. I told these Democrats before the examination that if they passed the examination I would give them places.’ That affiants then suggested, ‘ you mean if they got among the first four ?’ and said Jones answered ‘ Yes.’ That affiants asked as to Jones's intention about appointing Republicans, and said Jones answered, ‘ No Republicans passed this examination,’ referring to the examination held here June 10, 1885. That affiants expressed the opinion that Republicans were then examined, and Jones answered, ‘ Well, if they

passed I won't appoint them.' That in answer to further questions Jones said, 'If there was a Republican among the first four I would not appoint him if I knew it no matter how high he stood on examination. I would not appoint him because he was a Republican. I do not know just how many changes I shall make. I did not find any Democrats here, and I mean to make changes until the Democrats preponderate in the office. I think I can run this office better if I have at least a majority of my own faith. I don't know what the last election meant if it didn't mean that the Republicans were to be turned out. I intend to look first to the public interest, and then to that of my party. I shall make one change Saturday. I have promised a place to a Democrat, and I shall dismiss a letter carrier Saturday. He is an inefficient man,' then, swinging in his chair, Mr. Jones added, 'Oh, I don't know how many changes I shall make; I shall keep a few Republicans.' That said Jones further said, 'I follow the law in regard to examinations.' And in answer to the question, 'If you have a Republican in the classified service who is a good man, who does his work well, and against whom there is no complaint, will you put him out merely to give his place to a Democrat?' Jones said, 'I shall if I want to. That is my interpretation of the Civil Service Law.'

"Oscar P. Hoover being sworn says that he is thirty-four years old, and is a farmer, but is not now in any occupation. That he was appointed carrier in the Indianapolis postoffice in July, 1875, and was dismissed therefrom April 1, 1886. That on March 17, 1886, he was called into the office of Postmaster Jones, who said to him, 'We've been pretty good to you men all winter, and now I want you to resign the 1st of April.' That some days later affiant sent in his resignation to take effect July 15. That in the meantime Assistant Postmaster Dodd had several times asked affiant to sign a resignation, saying he wanted to send it to the department, but affiant insisted upon getting up his own. That when said resignation was received by said Jones he sent for affiant and said that he had some sort of document from affiant which he could not make out; he further said, '*It will be better for you to resign.* I have sufficient reasons for wanting your place, and I'll put another man in your place the 1st of April anyway if you don't,' which was done."

"Lindley Vinton, of C. & A. Potts & Co.; Worth Merritt, of George Merritt & Co.; D. A. Richardson, of Richardson & Evans; Isaac Thalman, of C. E. Geisendorff & Co.; S. S. Robinson, president Acme Milling Co., and T. E. Chandler, of Chandler & Taylor, being sworn, say that they are citizens of Indianapolis, whose mail was formerly delivered by Oscar P. Hoover, letter carrier. That hearing that said Hoover was about to be dismissed by Postmaster Jones, they called upon said Jones with a petition for said Hoover's retention, signed by many firms on said Hoover's route. That they stated to said Jones that said Hoover had been a faithful and efficient carrier, and that during his service of eleven years they had never heard any complaint about him, and they requested that he be retained. That said Jones's manner was very discourteous to affiants. That he peremptorily refused to consider the request or to receive said petition. That said Jones said that he had made arrangements to put another man in Hoover's place and he was going to do it. That to a question if there were any complaints against Hoover, said Jones said there had been complaints about the carrier service but there had been none against Hoover, and that he had done pretty well; that, said Jones said, was not the reason for changing, *but Hoover was well fixed—was the owner of a farm, and could take care of himself and didn't need the place.* He further said: '*And there are plenty of men who have a hard time to get bread and butter, and I am going to make places for them.*' That to a suggestion from affiant Vinton that the change contemplated would be a violation of the civil service law, said Jones gave affiants to understand that *that made no difference, that he had made up his mind to make these changes and that he was going to do it.*"

The following is from the affidavit of Will E. Tousey:

"That he then asked said Jones why he had called for affiant's resignation, and if there were any charges against him, to which said Jones replied that there were no charges. That affiant then asked said Jones if he had any complaint against or fault to find with affiant's efficiency or the way in which he had done his work, and said Jones answered, no, he had no complaint to make at all; *that all he wanted was affiant's place;* also, 'you appreciate, Mr. Tousey, that I am in a rather awkward place, pushed on by one party and held back by the other.' That affiant

then went and had in substance the same talk with said Dodd, and got the same replies. That said Dodd also added: 'When I was a young man, I had a friend of opposite politics with whom I used to get in warm discussions. My party was in office and my friend insisted they should get out, and when I asked why, he answered, 'because, by God, it ain't in the nature of things for you to stay there.'"

"Matthew A. Lockwood, being duly sworn, says that he is forty-two years old. That he served three years in the seventh Indiana regiment, and nine months in the one hundred and forty-eighth Indiana regiment. That he was appointed carrier in the Indianapolis postoffice in June, 1873, and was dismissed therefrom in March, 1886. That he carried mail on the same route for thirteen years. That about March 15, having heard that a number of men were to be dismissed, he asked Assistant Postmaster Dodd if he was one, and said Dodd replied that he did not know. That Postmaster Jones just then came along and said Dodd asked him. That said Jones named several, but not this affiant. That he told said Jones that he wanted to know about himself, because he had a family to look after; and said Jones answered: 'All right, I'll take you too. I'll accept your resignation for the 1st. You're all going anyway. I've kept all of you longer than I've wanted to. Summer's come now and you can make a living, and I want you all to get out of here. I've done better than the Republican party would.' That two days later said Dodd came to talk about the form of affiant's resignation, and offered to write it out; and affiant said to him: 'You are dismissing me, I suppose, because you want my place for somebody else. If you have any charges against me, or anything of that kind, I'd like to know it.' That said Dodd answered: 'There are no charges at all, Mr. Lockwood. You've always done your work well. We want your place for a Democrat. The party pressure outside is causing the removals. We are actually removing some men I think more of than the men we're taking in to fill their places. The new men are not as good men as some of the old we are discharging.' That this talk was, in substance, repeated with said Dodd the day before affiant left. That he handed in his resignation worded 'by request,' to take effect April 1st following, but left the office about ten days before that date."

"Gustav Schmedel, being sworn, says that he is twenty-four years old. That he was examined for admission to the civil service at Indianapolis in June, 1884, and attained a standing of 94.45. That he was appointed a carrier in the Indianapolis postoffice in September, 1884, and was dismissed therefrom May 31, 1886. That the first he heard of his dismissal was about May 20th, 1886, when he was called in by Postmaster Jones, and the following conversation took place:

Affiant—'How do you do, sir?'

Postmaster Jones—'How do you do? Your name is—?'

Affiant—'Gustav Schmedel.'

Postmaster Jones—'Ah! yes. Well, sir, I just wish to tell you that your resignation would be acceptable about, or rather on the 1st of June.'

Affiant—'Yes, sir. Any charges?'

Postmaster Jones—'No, no. Not a complaint to make; only I have a Democrat whom I wish to put in your place.'

Affiant—'All right, sir. Good day.'

"That a couple of days later Assistant Postmaster Dodd asked affiant if he should report him to Washington as having resigned; and affiant answered: 'Most emphatically, no, sir. If you wish to get rid of me, bounce me.' That affiant then asked said Dodd if there were any charges against him, and Dodd answered that he did not know, but that if affiant did not resign Mr. Jones would find some charges against him. That on said May 31st affiant went to cashier Ben Jones to draw his pay, and then asked him if there were any charges against affiant, and received for answer: 'I don't know, and I'm sick of the whole business.'"

CHIEF LOCAL EXAMINER DODD.

The first clear indication of Mr. Dodd's point of view was before entering upon the duties of his office. Being importuned to retain certain carriers, he replied: "If we begin to make promises to keep carriers, we shall have no places for our political friends." When the group of July 1 was dismissed, Mr. Dodd gave his opinion as follows concerning the changes in the postoffice proper: "Any

charges against the men dismissed?" [Wood, Hand, Wilmington, Wirt, Rumele, and Adams] was asked of the assistant postmaster. "No, sir; I am happy to state—none."

The irony of his position as chief local examiner is still further indicated by the following, in addition to what has already been shown :

"Levi S. Hand being sworn says that he is 45 years old and a carpenter ; that he served three years in the nineteenth Indiana regiment; that he was appointed distributing clerk in the Indianapolis postoffice in October, 1875, and was dismissed therefrom July 1, 1885. That the first affiant knew of his dismissal was when after he had been ill about ten days with rheumatism [except one day when he attempted to work], his dismissal to take effect immediately was sent up to his house. That afterward he called upon the cashier, Ben Jones, and asked why he had been dismissed, to which said Ben Jones replied that he did not know, and sent affiant to Assistant Postmaster Dodd, saying that said Dodd was running things. That affiant then asked said Dodd the reason for his dismissal, and said Dodd replied '*Well, really, I don't know any more than that we want your place for a Democrat. We've got to begin somewhere and so we begin with you.*'"

The following is from the affidavit of Frank Adams :

"That a day or two before his dismissal took effect he said to Assistant Postmaster Dodd : 'I hope I have performed my duties satisfactorily,' and said Dodd answered, '*Yes, we have no fault to find.*'"

"Oliver P. McLeland, being sworn, says that he is twenty-five years old, and a wood-working machinist; that he was appointed carrier in the Indianapolis postoffice in 1881, and was dismissed therefrom May 31, 1886; that about May 11, 1886, Postmaster Jones sent for him and said : 'I've been pretty good to you, and I'd like to have you good to me. I'll accept your resignation for the last of the month ;' that he made no reply, except to ask if that was all, and said Jones said it was; that on the last day of the same month Assistant Postmaster Dodd spoke to him and said : '*It is better for the boys to resign than to have us drum up charges against them;*' and further : '*It almost breaks Mr. Jones's heart to have to drum up any charges against the boys;*' and that there were no charges against the four who were to go that day except Abbett; that this affiant did not resign, but understood that he was dismissed; that the four referred to by said Dodd were this affiant, Gustav Schmedel, Rollin H. Blackledge and John Abbett, all carriers."

FORCED RESIGNATIONS.

Apparently somewhat racked by public criticism, Mr. Jones adopted a method of forcing resignations. In addition to those already showing this, I cite the following, from affidavits :

"Benjamin Crane, being sworn, says that he is fifty-one years old, and is by trade a carpenter. That he served four years and seven months in the twenty-sixth Ohio regiment. That he entered as a private and was a captain when mustered out. That he was wounded in battle. That he was appointed carrier in the Indianapolis postoffice in 1875. That he resigned by request of Postmaster Jones April 1, 1886. That the first intimation he had that he was to leave the service was about the second Saturday in March, 1886, when Postmaster Jones called him one side and said : 'Look here, Ben, just a word : All I've got to say is, your resignation will be accepted the first of April.' To which affiant replied : 'All right, sir.' That the following Monday Assistant Postmaster Dodd brought a written resignation for affiant to sign, which affiant did, to take effect said April 1. That to affiant's remark that he had nothing to add or to take from the resignation said Dodd replied : 'We've nothing against you, Ben, if you've nothing against us.'"

"Jacob H. Mattern, being sworn, says that he is fifty-one years old. That he was appointed carrier in the Indianapolis postoffice in 1869, and was dismissed therefrom April 1, 1886, by notice received March 13. That he carried mail on one route sixteen years. That the first he knew of his dismissal was when Postmaster Jones said to him : 'Mr. Mattern, I want your resignation by the first of April;' to which affiant replied, 'All right.' That later, affiant asked Assistant Postmaster Dodd if there were any charges against him and Dodd said there were none. That affiant accordingly handed in his resignation about April 1. That

affiant served over two years in the second Iowa regiment and was discharged for disability."

"Henry J. Brattain, being sworn, says that he is fifty-six years old. That he served two years and nine months in the seventy-ninth Indiana regiment, from which he was discharged at the close of the war. That he was appointed letter carrier in the Indianapolis postoffice at the beginning of the letter carrier system in that office—he thinks in 1869, and was dismissed therefrom October 31, 1885, on a written notice received about a week before, which was the first indication he had that he was to be dismissed. That he carried on the same route during his whole term of service except as his territory was cut off from and added to as the city increased. That his standing as a carrier, according to the reports of the office, was high. That no one connected with the office since Mr. Jones became postmaster in any way indicated to affiant that his work was not satisfactory."

"Hans Blume being sworn, says that he is forty-seven years old, that he was educated for a soldier and was a second lieutenant in the Prussian army. That he came to America in 1862, and after six months service as volunteer aid-de-camp, he became second lieutenant in the thirty-second Indiana regiment, and at the close of the war he was lieutenant colonel commanding that regiment. That he was appointed foreign delivery clerk in the Indianapolis postoffice in 1883, and resigned therefrom by request of Postmaster Jones March 1, 1886. That he made occasional mistakes such as would inevitably occur, but never of a nature serious enough to call out a reprimand from his superiors. That about the middle of February, 1886, Postmaster Jones sent for him and said, 'Blume, I have made up my mind that I want your place by the 1st of March.' That he informed said Jones that he could have his place at once if he wished it. That said Jones replied that the 1st of March would do. That the same afternoon he handed his resignation to Assistant Postmaster Dodd, and asked if there were any complaints or charges against him. That said Dodd answered: '*No, there are none, and there haven't been any, and we are well satisfied with your work; but you know how it is in politics; the postmaster is pushed harder by the Democrats than the people generally know, and he has to redeem himself with his party. He had to make room for one of them, and yours is the only place we can take at the present time.*'"

"William H. Fitch being sworn says that he is 57 years old and is a cabinet-maker, but is not now in any business. That he was appointed distributing clerk in the mailing department of the Indianapolis postoffice in March, 1877, and was dismissed therefrom by Postmaster Jones on July 1, 1886. That during said nine years of service he has had leave of absence but once, and then for a period of two weeks. That during said service he believes that the record of his daily work has been the highest with perhaps a single exception. That the first indication he had that he was to be dismissed, was when, on June 7, 1886, Postmaster Jones called him in and said, 'Mr. Fitch, I've kept you here a long while,' to which affiant replied: 'I thank you, Mr. Jones, for keeping me as long as you have.' That said Jones then said that he would like to have affiant's resignation by the 1st of July. That affiant then asked said Jones if there were any charges against him, and said Jones replied: '*Oh, no, no charges. You know how it is. I would just like your resignation by the 1st of July.*'"

William R. Williams, Jr., is the son of one of the carriers longest in the service. He is 19 years old and was examined for admission to the Civil Service in June, 1884, attaining a standing of 90.97. He was appointed clerk in the Indianapolis postoffice in September, 1884, and resigned therefrom by request of Postmaster Jones January 9, 1886. I am informed that when requested to resign he asked Mr. Jones if there were any charges against him, and the reply was: "*You have been here long enough.*" No incompetency or dereliction of duty was ever mentioned to him. His resignation was written out by the postmaster. He is now in the employ of the *Chicago News*.

UNEXPLAINED DISMISSALS.

A number have been dismissed for no assigned reason. For instance, Edgar W. Chittenden lived at Anderson, and passed the Civil Service examination in June, 1884,

upon a standing of 88 per cent, being 19 years old. He was appointed clerk the August following and was dismissed by Mr. Jones July 15, 1885, on one days' notice. James E. McGuire was a mechanic and a soldier, having served seventeen months. He passed the Civil Service examination in June, 1884, upon a standing of 83.8, being 47 years old. He was appointed carrier the following October and was dismissed by Mr. Jones in October, 1885. I also quote from the following:

"William L. Williams being sworn says that he is 32 years old and by profession a letter carrier. That his father was a soldier in the Union army and died of exposure at the siege of Vicksburg. That he was appointed letter carrier in the Indianapolis postoffice in 1872, and was dismissed therefrom October 31, 1885, on a week's notice. That he never was reprimanded and that he did his work well. That he had no talk with Jones and does not know why he was dismissed."

DISMISSALS ON "CHARGES."

The following are cited as cases where Mr. Jones has attempted to assign a cause for dismissal:

"Oakley O. Johnson, being sworn, says that he is thirty-four years old, and is by trade a heading turner. That he was appointed carrier in the Indianapolis postoffice in 1875, and was dismissed therefrom October 31, 1885, on a written notice received about a week before, which was the first indication he had that he was to be dismissed. That on receiving said notice he went to Postmaster Jones and asked the reason of his dismissal, and said Jones answered: 'Some of you are incompetent and some of you stopped at home for dinner on your way to the office.' That affiant's route was an outside route and his residence was there. That when he entered said office, in 1875, he found the custom existing by consent of the postmaster, of carriers so situated getting dinner at home before returning to the office from their forenoon's work; but in no case where outgoing mail would be delayed thereby. That this custom had existed ever since, and was the practice when said Jones became postmaster, and was never forbidden by said Jones or any of his agents. That James H. Deery, the new superintendent of carriers, had said that what had formerly been the custom would still be the law until changed. That affiant had not followed said custom for two months previous to his dismissal, for the reason that he had observed that good carriers were being dismissed, and he believed that said Jones was hunting for excuses to discharge the men and might make this one. That affiant's standing, as shown by the records of the office, was high."

"Charles P. Sample being sworn, says that he is twenty-seven years old, and is a carpenter. That he was examined for admission to the civil service in June, 1884, and attained a standing of 89.8. That he was appointed carrier on probation in the Indianapolis postoffice, September, 1884, and at the end of six months received an absolute appointment. That he was dismissed by Postmaster Jones July 4, 1885. That about June 1, 1885, Assistant Postmaster Dodd told him that John W. Howe had complained that affiant owed him a bill. That he told said Dodd that the debt was an honest one, and that he would pay it as soon as possible, and he called said Dodd's attention to the fact that affiant was only a substitute carrier, and was not earning on an average over \$6 a week. That his father had been for a long time out of work and affiant was obliged to use his earnings to support his family, and it would be impossible to pay the debt just then. That said Dodd replied, 'The first money you get, give him a dollar or two to stop his complaining,' and affiant promised to pay the first money he could spare, to which said Dodd replied, 'All right.' That without further warning he was dismissed. That he then talked with said Dodd, who told him that there was no charges except that he had not paid his debts. That the debt referred to was about \$10, being the balance of a debt incurred about December 20, 1884, for a cloak for affiant's sister. That he saw Jones and Dodd together some weeks after his dismissal, and both denied all recollection of any complaints that affiant had not paid his debts, and they further said that there were no complaints to make about affiant, but that Jones had a right to discharge him if he wanted to."

But other creditors appealed without success.

"Sarah Simmons, being sworn, says that she is a widow, and is the owner of a

grocery store in Indianapolis. That Harry Crane, a mail carrier of the Indianapolis postoffice appointed by Postmaster Jones is indebted to her in the sum of forty-seven and $\frac{96}{100}$ dollars for groceries furnished to said Crane's family about four years ago by affiant's husband, now deceased, and who was formerly the owner of said grocery business. That affiant helped her said husband in the store, and knows that said groceries were furnished. That affiant's husband in his lifetime frequently asked said Crane to pay said bill, but never could get any money from him, although said Crane was earning good wages. That since her said husband's death this affiant has asked said Crane to pay said bill, but has not been able to collect any part of it. That said Crane later claimed that he had made a payment on said bill, and then this affiant told said Crane to pay what he claimed was the correct amount, but he has never paid anything. That said Crane succeeded William L. Williams as mail carrier. That after he had been a mail carrier for seven or eight months this affiant went to Postmaster Jones and told him of said unpaid bill, and asked him if he couldn't do something to make said Crane pay the same, and said Jones said that he would advise said Crane to pay said bill, *but that he had no power to turn him off if he did not pay it.* That said talk with Jones was in May, 1886, and none of said bill has been paid."

THE STERN'S CASE—APPEAL OF THE DISCHARGED CARRIER TO THE PRESIDENT.
To Grover Cleveland, President of the United States :

I earnestly ask your consideration of the following facts :

STATE OF INDIANA, COUNTY OF MARION, SS :

"Henry Sterns, being sworn, says that in 1880 he was appointed by W. R. Holloway, then postmaster, to the position of letter carrier in the postoffice of the city of Indianapolis; that he continued in said position the balance of said Holloway's term, and during the four years term of his successor, James A. Wildman, and also under said Wildman's successor, Aquilla Jones, until December 6, 1885. That he at all times performed the duties of said position in a competent and honest manner, and, so far as he was informed, to the satisfaction of his superiors. That on the evening of November 25 last, according to his custom, he rode home from the postoffice in a street car; that two other men were in the car with him, the driver being upon the platform, and the door thereto closed; that in the car the death of the Vice President, which had just occurred, was talked of; that the conversation throughout was becoming and respectful; that neither of the other men was then known to this affiant, and both, at different points, left the car before he did; that knowing this driver from having frequently been a passenger on his car, just as this affiant was about to quit the car he opened the door to the driver, and said to him, 'Tom Hendricks is dead;' that to the driver's exclamation, 'What!' the affiant repeated, 'Hendricks is dead,' and immediately left the car; that this was all the conversation with said driver. That on Sunday, December 6, 1885, while this affiant was about his duties in the postoffice, he was summoned to the office of Mr. Jones, the postmaster; that in the room during the conversation which followed were the postmaster and his son John Jones [not one of the two employed in the postoffice], Mr. Dodd, the Assistant Postmaster, and the aforesaid car driver, Frank Ash; that Mr. Jones at once said to this affiant, 'This man [pointing to the street car driver] says that you were jovial over Mr. Hendricks's death, and were talking and laughing on the car all the way home that evening.' That thereupon this affiant without qualification, denied the charge; that said car driver then repeated the charge, and this affiant again denied it, and at once offered to disprove the assertion if he could have time to hunt up one of the men who was in the car with him, whom he informed the Postmaster he would know if he saw, being a large man weighing about 250 pounds; 'that Mr. Jones answered there is no use talking any more about it.' That this affiant thereupon returned to his desk, and in less than a minute Mr. Dodd laid upon it the following communication :

"INDIANAPOLIS POSTOFFICE, Dec. 6, 1885.

"HENRY STERNS—Your services as carrier are not required after this date.

"AQUILLA JONES, Postmaster."

"That the assertions of the car driver Ash were false; that this affiant did not speak or act, and had no inclination to speak or act disrespectfully concerning Mr. Hendricks, and of the truth of this he makes his solemn oath. That on December 14 this affiant succeeded in finding out the two men who were in the car with him

as aforesaid, one of them being Mr. John H. Stewart, president of the Bank of Commeree, and the other Mr. A. W. Wishard, an attorney at law, both of Indianapolis, and to substantiate his own statements this affiant offers their affidavits, which follow, and to support the statement of faithful service this affiant attaches also a certificate from the ex-postmaster, James A. Wildman. HENRY STERNS."

"Subscribed and sworn to before me this 28th day of December, 1885.

[Seal.]

"WM. S. HUBBARD, Notary Public."

"STATE OF INDIANA, MARION COUNTY, ss :

"John H. Stewart and Albert W. Wishard, being duly sworn, state that the said Stewart is the president of the Bank of Commeree, in the city of Indianapolis, and that said Wishard is an attorney at law in said city; that upon Wednesday, November 25, 1885, the said Stewart was a passenger on the Pennsylvania street car at a short time after 5 P. M., having taken the ear at Washington street; that as the car passed Chas. Meyer's eigar store, about half a square north of Washington street, the affiant Wishard stepped on the ear and walked up to the fare box, paid his fare, returned to the rear end of the ear, where the affiant Stewart sat; affiant Wishard then stated to affiant Stewart that he had just heard, in Meyer's eigar store, that Governor Hendricks (Vice President Hendricks) had dropped dead, at which statement the affiant Stewart expressed great surprise and expressed doubt at the report. Just at the time the foregoing conversation took place between the affiants Stewart and Wishard, Mr. Henry Sterns, a mail carrier of said city, stepped into the car as it passed the postoffice going north on Pennsylvania street; as said Sterns entered the ear affiant Wishard asked Sterns if the report of the death of Governor Hendricks had been received at the postoffice, to which said Sterns answered in the affirmative, saying that the report was true, after which said Sterns took a seat in the ear, nearly opposite where affiants Stewart and Wishard sat. The affiants then engaged in a general conversation in regard to the death of Governor Hendricks, about Governor Hendricks having been in the bank of which affiant Stewart is president on the day previous to his death, and about Governors Hendricks and Morton being the leaders in their respective parties, etc., in which said Sterns took no part further than to answer a question asked by affiant Wishard as to the time when the report of the death of Governor Hendricks first reached the postoffice. Affiant Wishard rode on the car to Pratt street, about nine squares from where he entered it, and affiant Stewart nearly seventeen squares, or near to Seventh street. And affiants both state that during the time they were passengers upon said car said Sterns was also a passenger, except a part of the first square, affiants having got on the car before said Sterns; affiants both state that while they were passengers on the car the conduct of said Sterns was perfectly quiet and gentlemanly; that he did not express any satisfaction or gratification over the death of Governor Hendricks, and that any statement made by any one that said Sterns acted in a jovial manner over the death of Governor Hendricks is untrue and maliciously false.

"JOHN H. STEWART,

"ALBERT W. WISHARD."

Subscribed and sworn to this 24th day of December, 1885, by Albert W. Wishard.

[Seal.]

H. J. EVERETT, *Notary Public.*

Subscribed and sworn to by John H. Stewart, before me this 24th day of December, 1885.

[Seal.]

J. M. RIDENOUR, *Notary Public.*

I hereby certify that Henry Sterns, who was a letter carrier in the Indianapolis postoffice during my term of office, performed his duties faithfully and efficiently.

J. A. WILDMAN, *Ex-Postmaster of Indianapolis.*

The foregoing affidavits set out the truth of this matter. There was, however, as it appears, a short period when the driver and myself were the only persons on the ear. As to that period it is a question which of us is to be believed. Under such circumstances it is proper to refer to the personal history of the man whose statement was believed rather than mine. I was left alone in the world at seven years of age. I have worked for many different people, and have always had the confidence of my employers. I have always performed my duties as a citizen;

the law has never had to lay hold of me. On the other hand, I call your attention to the following records relating to the car driver Ash :

State of Indiana *vs.* Frank Ash, Albert Cropley. No. 138. Felony Docket, No. 12.

Be it remembered, that on this 27th day of January, 1881, came J. F. Hennessey and filed an affidavit charging the defendant with the crime of grand larceny, upon which a warrant was issued for the arrest of the defendant, and the Marshal, on the 27th day of January, 1881, returned the same served by bringing the defendant into court, and the defendant having been arraigned for plea, says that he is not guilty as charged, and waives an examination. Whereupon I required the defendant to enter into a recognizance in the sum of one hundred dollars for his appearance at the first day of the next term of the Marion Circuit Court.

Witness my signature.

J. CAVEN, *Mayor*.

The defendant failing to enter into a recognizance as required by me, I issued a mittimus for his commitment to jail, and delivered the same to the Marshal.

J. CAVEN, *Mayor*.

State of Indiana, Marion County, ss :

I, the undersigned, Mayor of the city of Indianapolis, hereby certify that the foregoing is a true, full and complete transcript of the judgment in the above entitled cause, as the same remains of record in my office.

Witness my signature and the seal of said city this 23d day of December, 1885.

[Seal.]

JOHN L. McMASTER, *Mayor*.

[Statutes of Indiana, Revision of 1881.]

Section 6213. If any accusation of the commission of any crime or misdemeanor shall be made against any infant under the age of 16 years before any grand jury, and the charge appears to be supported by evidence sufficient to put the accused upon trial, the grand jurors may, in their discretion, instead of finding an indictment against the accused, return to the court that it appears to them that the accused is a suitable person to be committed to the guardianship of said institution (meaning the House of Refuge), and the court may thereupon order such commitment, if satisfied from the evidence that such commitment ought to be made; which hearing may be waived by the parent or guardian of such minor.

State of Indiana, Marion County, ss :

Be it remembered, that heretofore, to wit, at a term of the Criminal Court of Marion county, in the State of Indiana, begun, holden and continued at the court house, in the city of Indianapolis, on the 20th day of May, 1881, the same being the 119th judicial day of the January term, A. D. 1881, of the said Criminal Court of Marion county, before the Honorable James E. Heller, Judge of the Criminal Court of Marion county, of the State of Indiana, and sole Judge of the Criminal Court of Marion county, Indiana, the following proceedings were had in the cause of

The State of Indiana *vs.* Frank Ash *et al.* No. 11,641. Rec. of Grand Jury to House of Refuge.

Comes John B. Elam, prosecuting the pleas of the State of Indiana herein, and comes also defendant Frank Ash, in his own proper person, and the grand jury having recommended that the defendant, Frank Ash, be sent to the House of Refuge, and the evidence in this behalf having been heard, and the court being fully advised in the premises, finds that the defendant, Frank Ash, is a proper person to be committed to the care and custody of the Board of Managers of the House of Refuge. It is therefore considered and adjudged by the court that the defendant, Frank Ash, be and he is hereby committed to the care and custody of the Board of Managers of the House of Refuge until he is reformed or attains the age of twenty-one years, unless sooner legally discharged. And the Sheriff of Marion county is charged with the due execution of the foregoing judgment.

State of Indiana, Marion county, ss ; Marion Criminal Court:

I, Moses G. McLain, Clerk of the Marion Criminal Court of Marion county, in the State of Indiana, do hereby certify that the foregoing is a true and complete copy of the proceedings and judgment of said court in the above entitled cause on the day and year first aforesaid, as appears of record in my office.

In testimony whereof I hereunto subscribe my name and hereto affix the seal of said Criminal Court of Marion county at my office in the city of Indianapolis, this 23d day of December, A. D. 1885.

MOSES G. McLAIN,

Clerk of Criminal Court of Marion county, Indiana.

Mayor's Office, Room 13, Court House, John L. McMaster, Mayor, G. S. Wright, }
Prosecuting Attorney,
INDIANAPOLIS, IND., December 23, 1885. }

Robert McHatton, Esq., Plainfield, Indiana :

DEAR SIR—Will you be kind enough to furnish me with the date when Frank Ash was received in the Reform School and the date when discharged ; also the age given at the time of his admission. I think he was received May, 1881.

Yours truly, G. S. WRIGHT.

DEAR SIR—Frank Ash was admitted to the institution May 24, 1881 ; he was released July 31, 1882 ; he was fifteen years old when admitted.

Very respectfully,

ROBERT MCHATTON.

I am in debt for a small home and have a family to support. You will see from the foregoing papers that, without opportunity for defense, without warning, in the middle of winter when it is very difficult to get work, upon the unsupported statement of a man yet under age, and who already, upon a charge of grand lar-

ceny, has been confined for fourteen months in a reform school, I am dismissed from a position to which I was entitled under the law for good service. Further, I am put before the community upon whom I must depend for work in the light of showing indecent behavior at a time when the public was deeply shocked. I therefore respectfully ask you to see that justice is done me in this matter.

INDIANAPOLIS, December 28, 1885.

HENRY STERNS.

No notice was taken of this appeal. Mr. Jones evidently relied with safety on the Russian proverb, "Heaven is high and the Czar is far off."

I do not attempt to characterize the conduct described in the following extracts:

"James M. Eades, being sworn, says that he is forty-five years old, and was a farmer, but is not now in any business. That he served two years and a half in the seventieth Indiana regiment, and lost a leg at the battle of New Hope Church. That he was appointed general delivery clerk in the Indianapolis postoffice in 1869, and was dismissed therefrom April 17, 1886. That a day or two before Mr. Jones took charge (in April, 1885) of the postoffice, affiant called upon him and informed him of the position he occupied; of the fact that he had lost a leg in the war, showing said Jones his wooden leg, and told him that he wouldn't urge his wooden leg as an argument for staying, but he didn't want to work in suspense, and asked what would be done with him. That said Jones said: 'You don't want me to tell you right now?' and affiant said he would like to know by Saturday. That Jones then said: 'I won't keep you in suspense; I will let you know by Saturday.' That said Jones did not wait until Saturday, but came the next day to the general delivery window and said: 'Mr. Eades, you needn't anticipate any very early change;' to which affiant replied: 'Mr. Jones, *very early change* doesn't relieve suspense a particle.' That Jones replied: 'Well, I'll see you to-morrow.' That on the morrow Mr. Dodd came and said: 'Mr. Jones and I have considered this matter over, and have come to the conclusion that if we let you go, we would have to take some one from the civil service list, and perhaps we wouldn't think any more of him than we do of you, and we've concluded to leave you where you are.' That about three weeks before April 17, 1886, Dodd came and said Mr. Jones would accept affiant's resignation on April 1. That affiant replied that he would not resign, but if they wanted his place, they could bring a man and take it. That the newspapers were severe on said Jones for his broken promises, and after their publication, being called to his room, affiant stated to him their original conversation, and said Jones then said that he didn't remember affiant's telling him that he had lost his leg in the army. That Jones then said that he wouldn't be ready for affiant to go by the 1st, but had concluded to let him stay a year from the time said Jones took charge, April 19; he also said that there had been complaints that affiant did not look for letters for some people waiting, and that affiant did not know how the pressure was. That affiant has asked said Jones to give him the names of the persons who made such complaints; but said Jones replied that he did not know their names, but that if he should see those persons he would know them."

"Rollin H. Blackledge, being sworn, says that he is twenty-five years old. That he was a teacher in Franklin county, Indiana, and was examined for admission to the civil service in February, 1885, attaining a standing of 94.5. That he was a stranger at Indianapolis. That he was appointed carrier in the Indianapolis postoffice in March, 1885, and was dismissed therefrom June 1, 1886. That the first he heard about his leaving the service was about April 1, 1886, when Assistant Postmaster Dodd told him that he understood that he was preparing for another pursuit, and he thought that they could compromise on the time of his leaving. That their intention had been to let him go April 15, but if it was agreeable they would make it June 1, and that he [said Dodd] could fix it with Mr. Jones. That he told said Dodd that he knew the men were being dismissed, and did not seem to have any protection under the law, and he expected to have to go, but he wanted to make the best time he could, and proposed the 1st of July. That said Dodd replied: 'It's as much as a bargain to get Mr. Jones to extend the time beyond the 15th, the outside pressure is so great.' And affiant then told him that if he could not get any longer time, he should be glad to get until June 1. That

said Dodd also said that Mr. Jones had information from the Civil Service Commission at Washington that he could discharge whom he pleased regardless of cause. That said Dodd then told him to hand in his resignation. That affiant then began to look for other employment, and secured a place, to take which he left his work as a carrier a few days before June 1st, but did not hand in any resignation. That sometime before leaving he asked said Jones if there were any charges against him. And having asked and learned affiant's name said Jones replied: 'Nothing special that I know of; if there is anything, I'll let you know.' That on Thursday, May 27th, the day of Bynum's convention, affiant went back and asked said Dodd for a recommendation, and said Dodd replied that he was so busy with the convention and so excited that he couldn't attend to anything else that day, but would give it to him the next day. That said convention was to nominate a Democratic candidate for Congress. That on the Saturday following having gone to draw his pay affiant then told said Jones that his answer concerning charges was unsatisfactory and he would like to know the truth. That said Jones seemed very nervous and uneasy, and replied that he would have to consult Captain Dodd before giving affiant an answer. That affiant went back to his new place but in half an hour was recalled to the postoffice by telephone, where he found said Dodd and Jones. That said Dodd asked, 'What possessed you to ask Mr. Jones the question you did;' and affiant replied that he had asked the same question before and obtained an unsatisfactory answer; that he had asked Mr. Jones if there were any charges that made him discharge affiant in preference to somebody else, and he wanted a more satisfactory answer. That said Dodd said he did not comprehend what affiant meant by the word discharge; that he had never been discharged. That he thought affiant understood why he had been selected; that he had been selected because by making a vacancy they could get a man in out of the list examined in June, 1885, which was about to expire, and affiant says that that object had never been mentioned to him before, and he told them that they spoke of letting him go the 15th of April and he regarded it as a discharge, and got as much longer time as he could. And said Dodd then denied that there had been any danger of affiant's dismissal on the 15th of April, but that as affiant was preparing for something else and did not expect to stay in the office long anyhow, he had resigned to give them a chance to take a man from that list. That affiant replied that he had never resigned that he knew of, but considered that he was discharged. That finally said Dodd said, 'To show our good faith in this, see here what we have written for you,' and he brought out a recommendation signed by himself and Jones; he also said that the resignation had been reported to Washington and would have to stand; also 'if you don't want this paper and don't want to resign I can't help it,' and he added that he thought the recommendation would be of great help to affiant. That affiant then asked if it was necessary to write a resignation, and Dodd replied that it would protect them; that they would have something to show if the resignation was denied. That affiant regarding it as a hopeless case and having known them to dismiss men without charges and afterward get up charges against them, and wanting the recommendation to cut off such action, wrote out his resignation, dating it back to about April 15. That the following is a copy of said recommendation:

" 'UNITED STATES POSTOFFICE,
" 'INDIANAPOLIS, IND., May 28, 1886.

" 'Mr. Rollin H. Blackledge having resigned his position in the postoffice for other pursuits, we cheerfully recommend him as a young man of good character, good habits and good capacity; and trust that he may find in some more congenial calling the appreciation he merits.

AQUILLA JONES, SR., *Postmaster*.
" 'JOHN W. DODD, *Ass't P. M.*'

"That 'the something else' referred to by said Dodd arose from the fact that affiant in his leisure hours was learning short-hand writing with a view to that business in the indefinite future; that he would have been glad to retain his position as carrier for at least several years. That he is now working as a wood working machine hand at \$1.75 a day. That his pay as carrier was \$50 a month, and in one month his pay would have been advanced to \$60 a month. That Oscar N. Wilmington was one against whom they got up charges after his dismissal."

THE CLASSIFIED SERVICE-APPOINTMENTS.

It is a curious fact that a large proportion of those who have received appointments are those who, if the office had been openly run under the spoils system would have claimed them directly or vicariously as rewards for party services. I here give some instances. There are some good though inexperienced men, but there are also a lot of party workers, with a considerable contingent of low ward politicians, and a few are strikingly illiterate. They are largely of that class which it was thought the competitive system would exclude from places.

Although Mr. Jones had stated that he had removed Wilmington solely because he had promised his place to a Democrat; yet when called upon weeks later to answer as to his acts, he cast about for a better reason, saying, "I have taken pains to learn the truth of his being an offensive partisan."

He submitted the following evidence :

INDIANAPOLIS, IND., July 27, 1885.

We, the undersigned, members of the first precinct of the First Ward of the city of Indianapolis, hereby certify that we personally know Oscar N. Wilmington, and that we know him to be an active Republican, and that he acted as challenger for the Republicans at the presidential election last past.

HOWARD L. LINDSEY, 64 Malott ave.
GEORGE MILLER, 64 Malott ave.
WILLIAM TIMMENS, 478 Lincoln ave.
C. H. SCHRECKENGAST, 46½ Malott ave.
FRED. M. SNYDER, 64 Malott ave,
JOHN P. FRANZ, 40½ Malott ave.

Schreckengast was confronted with the charge by Wilmington in the presence of witnesses, of whom I was one, and at once repudiated it, saying he had signed because he saw the names of other signers. John P. Franz said to me that he did not know Wilmington by sight; that persons had come around in the night wanting some statement against Wilmington, and that he had signed relying on their representations. Franz made a written statement of these facts, and did all he could to remedy the wrong done. In addition, the actual challenger, Plummer, and the committeeman, Carter, of Wilmington's precinct, testified that he was at the polls only a few minutes, and at no time acted as challenger. The books at Wilmington's office showed that he was there all day long on election day receipting for packages, except at dinner-time. He has never been a politician.

By the side of the facts relating to Wilmington it is proper to place those relating to his successor, Henry R. Browning. The latter is a nephew of Austin H. Brown, a member of the Democratic National Committee. Before the June examination enquiries in Browning's interest were made about the emoluments and duties of Wilmington's place. Browning was a ward politician, and since his appointment he has been a delegate to a convention and has repeatedly taken part in primaries. To illustrate, he was present at a primary to choose delegates for the last congressional convention. I quote from the affidavit of a bystander: "That he saw said Henry R. Browning, then and now a clerk as aforesaid, at said primary. That said Browning was very actively working for the renomination of said Bynum. That in said primary said Browning made motions and speeches, and took a very prominent part. That shortly before said primary opened said Browning, in the interest of said Bynum, had a fight with one Hennessey. That a large crowd was present and witnessed said fight."

Alfred Harrison, appointed carrier, was an active negro politician of a low type, with bad habits and character. When a Republican he was tried in the railway mail service with the result shown by the following letter :

POST OFFICE DEPARTMENT,
Office of the General Supt. of Railway Mail Service.
WASHINGTON, D. C., July 15, 1886.

Lucius B. Swift, Esq., corner Washington and Meridian Sts., Indianapolis, Ind. :

SIR: I have yours of July 9, asking that you be furnished a statement of the standing of Alfred Harrison, formerly a Clerk in this service.

In reply I would state that he was appointed a railway postal clerk upon the line between Indianapolis and Louisville, June 26, 1882, given an extension of three months December 23, 1882, and dropped from the service March 22, 1883, because he did not fulfill the requirements of the service. He was industrious and willing to obey instructions, but he was careless and very slow in his distribution. He did not exhibit any aptitude for the service, and numerous complaints were received regarding the work upon his line while he was on it. He could not read very readily.

Under date of March 22, 1883, Assistant Superintendent Lund, reported as follows:

"Harrison seems to be absent minded and forgetful, and has to be watched in order to keep the mails straight."

Superintendent French, in making final report in Harrison's case under date of March 17, 1883, stated:

"I would invite special attention to Mr. Harrison's case-examinations which, it will be noticed, have been very poor indeed. This closes Mr. Harrison's second probationary appointment. I think he has had as fair a trial as could be asked. I can not recommend that he be continued in the service."

Upon these recommendations and the statement of his case-examination record the appointment of Mr. Harrison was allowed to expire.

Very respectfully,

JNO. JAMESON, General Superintendent.

After his appointment by Mr. Jones, the following letters appeared in the *Indianapolis Times* of March 3, 1886, and were not questioned, yet the writer was retained in the Federal service. The first was addressed to the Republican candidate for township trustee.

"January 30, 1884.

"Mr. De Ruiter :

"SIR—The following proposition I herewith submit, that you and I may know and understand each other. I am doing effectual work for you and expect to do so until you get the nomination and be elected. There need be some effectual work done yet in Center N. E., S. E., N. W. and S. W., and the city. I am now ready to pull off my coat and go into this fight in all of these places among my people and your white friends, until the battle is fought and won. I can and will do as much for you as any man in the township. I have not been in a hurry in coming to an understanding with you; but now I do so. My proposition now is this: For the above consideration I think \$25 is but reasonable. You will find me as true as steel to your interests. You will find my foot prints in every part of the township. I shall be present aid in holding up your arms in the convention.

"Beware of those men who take your confidence and open not their mouths for after that, I prove myself by my works. I will report to you daily of the outlook and of my work.

"If you accept my proposition, leave an answer at C. C. Glass's, 24½ East Washington street, February 1. And let me have \$5 then and the remainder by installments at \$5 per week until paid (\$25).

"And if you should not accept, why all so well and good.

"ALFRED HARRISON."

The proposition was not accepted. Six months later Harrison wrote as follows:

"INDIANAPOLIS, IND., June 19, 1884.

"Mr. Coy, Chairman Democratic Committee:

"Knowing the feeling of discord generally among our people and my feeling personally, I would say that if the Democracy of this county will avail itself of the present opportunity, there is here a great prospect of the Democracy to sweep the entire country next fall. My people are ripe for a general revolution from Republican domination. Now, the question is, if the county Democracy aid a few of us in organizing into clubs for the purpose of affecting a sure break and helping the Democracy to victory. There will be a break and the Republicans can never more expect a solid vote of the negro ranks. What we want is organiza-

tion among us in this county; and whatever may be the incidental expenses in so doing, we will look to you for assistance.

"There is a move on foot to get up a negro Democratic paper, to be run in the interests of the Democracy, and I simply call your attention to these matters that you may avail yourself of the present and come into power.

"Yours,

A. HARRISON,
"No. 1 Clifford avenue.

"E. E. Cooper, being sworn, says that he is twenty-six years old, and has known Alfred Harrison seven years. That about two weeks previous to the County Democratic Convention, held in this city in June --, 1886, affiant was at a meeting of a non-partisan literary association of the colored people, held in Allen Chapel on Broadway, this city, and said Harrison made a speech of about thirty minutes, in which he advised the colored people to leave the Republican party and to join the Democratic party, and stated in detail the advantages that had come to the colored people from the Cleveland administration, and he called attention to the fact that he had obtained a place in the postoffice, and Mr. Hill in the railway mail service, and Dr. Robbins had the option of a place in Washington City, and Scott Turner had had the offer of a place in the mail bag department of the city postoffice, but had declined it, thinking it wasn't good enough. And he laid great stress on the fact that if, with only ten or twelve colored Democrats, they had obtained such political recognition, they had only to come over to the Democratic party in great numbers to obtain great recognition, and that the Democratic party had now the money and power and would probably remain in power sixteen or twenty years. That about a week later affiant heard said Harrison make a speech of about the same length and in the same vein at another literary meeting in South Calvary Church, on the corner of South Meridian and Morris streets. That said Harrison at these times was a carrier in the Indianapolis postoffice."

Later Harrison was arrested on a charge of forging a check, for which he was indicted, and is now awaiting trial. During the preliminary investigation the following document was brought to light and used to prove his handwriting:

"Samson Swannegan vs. Lucy V. Swannegan, June 6, 1883:

"Wherein A. Harrison appears for the defendant. The following proposition, though a digression from the ordinary course of practice, I hereinafter agree to, in consideration of the facts and circumstances of the case, to-wit: I will default the case and not appear when it shall be called, nor will I so inform my client of the matter; and further, to better hide my tracks from being known, I will have legal business out of the city that day when the case is called up, say at Richmond, Ind., where I shall be gone when the case is called.

"It can be worked in this way nicely and successfully, and while she is in bed, more successfully. I will so default my client upon these terms in consideration of \$10, nothing more or less. And not after it is done and all over; I will only accept in advance. You may trust my honor as to this, my proposition, for I will do as agreed, and here stipulated. And if we agree as to my terms let me know at once and will then take the steps necessary to effect our purpose.

"I will, if we agree, look for and expect a settlement in terms mentioned by at least Saturday morning, June 9, 1883.

"See your client Saturday, being rule day, in room 3, you would better, if we agreed, to have the defendant called and the case set down for trial and let it be settled as soon as possible.

"Yours,

A. HARRISON."

Harrison is still retained by Mr. Jones, but he is at present under suspension. He was a prominent stage usher at a political meeting in Indianapolis addressed by Senator Voorhees September 27, last.

I place beside the Harrison case that of Eddy and Armstead. They were carriers when Mr. Jones came into office. Eddy had been a carrier twelve years and Armstead four years. Both had families and were men of good character; their efficiency was of the highest. Regarding Eddy, I quote from Mr. Jones himself: "You are the best carrier we've got in the office, and you've got more friends on your route than any other man in the office." One morning these carriers disputed in the presence of the superintendent of carriers; the dispute could have been stopped by a word, but it was allowed to go on, and the men came to blows. It would seem that this offence, compared with the offences of Harrison, would have much in its favor, and that, considering the high standing and many years

of good conduct and faithful and efficient service of Eddy and Armstead, a period of suspension would have been a severe and ample punishment. They were, however, dismissed without anything that could be called a hearing, and without any attempt to determine if either was excusable.

James O. George was appointed carrier. His standing as a politician is fairly illustrated by the following from the *Indianapolis Times* of September 3, 1885, relating to a primary of the twenty-second ward, held in the rear of a saloon.

"Pat. Kelly was made chairman, and, obedient to the dictation of Wagner's saloon crowd, refused to allow votes to be taken by division. The Wagner crowd yelled 'Aye,' Kelly said the 'Ayes have it,' and all was settled. Wagner brought down a list of delegates. James O. George, of the eighteenth ward, moved that the list be elected unanimously, and Wagner's crowd yelled 'Aye,' and Kelly said 'Carried.' * * * The indignation was intense, as Wagner's crowd numbered thirty at the outside. A citizen of the twenty-second ward stood upon a table and announced that the 'bum' elements of the eighteenth and other wards, * * * having nominated their delegates and councilman, the citizens of the twenty-second ward, if allowed, would proceed to nominate their ticket."

George had already been elected a delegate from his own primary.

The following affidavit shows his views of the duties of the politician in the classified service. Dr. Ferguson is a reliable citizen of Indianapolis:

THE POSTAL SERVICE HERE.

To the Editor of The Indianapolis News:

For over one year I have been annoyed beyond endurance by the delay in the delivery of my mail, and by the loss of some of my most valued exchanges. Mail belonging to other parties and to other publications has often been delivered at my office, and has lain there for days before I have had an opportunity to return it to the carrier, while my mail has been bandied about in various quarters of the city before it has reached its proper destination. The mail of the Indiana Eclectic Medical Journal, the Indiana School Journal, the Indianapolis Journal, the Physio-Medical Journal and various other publications, has often been left at my office, as well as many private letters belonging to other parties in various parts of the city.

I have often protested to the carrier and to Mr. Jones against such gross and inexcusable carelessness, but to no purpose. About two weeks ago a letter was left in my office belonging to a lady living at 48 East North street, where it lay for three or four days before I had an opportunity to return it to the carrier. When I returned it to him, with the remark that "48 North street was a long way from 19 West Ohio," he became insolent, and gave me to understand that he would leave just such mail at my office as he chose, and if I did not like it I could go to sheol, or words to that effect. I reported him to Mr. Jones, but he paid no attention to the matter.

On the 6th of this month I wrote to the publisher of one of my exchanges, complaining that I had not received a copy of his publication since December, 1885, to which I received the following reply:

ST. LOUIS, July 7, 1886.

Dr. Frank C. Ferguson:

DEAR SIR: Your favor of the 6th inst. to hand. The reason we stopped the "Annals of Surgery" is that the January number was returned by your office. We have now placed you again on our list, etc.

J. H. CHAMBERS & CO.

Postmaster Jones's total unconcern for the prompt delivery and dispatch of mail; his entire indifference to the just complaints of our citizens and business men; his discharge of faithful and competent employes for no other reason than that they are Republicans, and filling their places with ward heclers and party bummers, some of whom can scarcely read, has produced widespread distrust, and is doing the city great harm. The postal service in this city is a disgrace to Jones, to his party and to the State.

FRANK C. FERGUSON.

Editor Indiana Medical Journal.

STATE OF INDIANA, COUNTY OF MARION.

Frank C. Ferguson, M. D., being sworn, says that the statements in the above letter are true. That the name of the carrier referred to is James George, and that said carrier was appointed by Postmaster Jones in place of an efficient carrier. That when remonstrated with as stated in said letter, said carrier's words were, "I'll leave just such mail here as I like, and if you don't like it, you may go to hell." That the affiant in the presence of the carrier repeated these words and the other facts to Postmaster Jones, and said Jones, in a rude and insulting manner, told affiant that he had heard enough, and that the carrier would remain.

FRANK C. FERGUSON.

Subscribed and sworn to before me this 14th day of July, 1886.

LUCIUS B. SWIFT, *Notary Public.*

As Mr. Jones indicated, George "remains." It is proper to contrast this case with that of James M. Eades, a crippled soldier, with many years of service satisfactory to the public at his back, whose affidavit states that having demanded his resignation and been severely criticised for it, Mr. Jones then said there had been complaints that Eades did not look for letters for people waiting. Being asked for their names, Mr. Jones replied that he did not know their names, but that he would know those persons if he should see them.

Charles Noe, appointed carrier, had been in the service but a short time when he was detected stealing registered letters. He plead guilty and was sentenced by the United States Court to one year in the work house. His antecedents were well known, and were such as to put the postmaster upon the most diligent enquiry concerning the boy himself. Such an enquiry would have shown Noe's complete unfitness for appointment. The mystery of his appointment has never been explained.

Patrick Ward, appointed carrier, was formerly a hand in a mill, managed by Mr. Jones. He reads writing with the greatest difficulty, and while delivering mail, frequently called upon other persons to read the addresses of mail to be delivered. He was put upon a route, but the people made such an outcry over his mistakes that he was withdrawn and set to collecting mail. His mistakes were such as arise only from illiteracy. He is a politician of long standing. I learn from entirely reliable sources that by reason of his defective education his admission into the service was inexplicable to those who had known him long and well.

David M. Conklin and John B. Green, appointed clerks, were employes of the Indianapolis *Sentinel*. Since his appointment, Green has been a delegate to a convention. William Darby, a driver, and James Cantlin, a "spotter" of the Street Car Company, were appointed carriers. Arthur Byfield, appointed clerk in the money order department, is the son of a very influential Democrat. Sometime later he resigned and another son, C. W. Byfield, who had not been in the service was appointed to the same position, and has since held it.

George W. Kuhn, a young man appointed in place of Hans Blume, is of the political type known as "a hustler." A prominent Democrat, complaining of his factional treachery in the Bynum congressional controversy, said, "I helped him to get his place." According to the "records" he came in under the competitive system. Since his appointment he has peddled tickets, been a committeeman, and in other ways worked diligently in the primaries, and wanted to be a delegate to the recent Bynum convention.

Joseph House, appointed clerk in place of Eades, was and is a chronic ward politician. He works hard for delegates in primaries and candidates in conventions. At present he is a councilman. Ed. R. Ellis, F. A. Lorenz, William R. Marlatt, H. W. Harrington and others, have, since appointment, done political work. I quote from an affidavit relating to Marlatt, and referring to a congressional primary: "That said Marlatt, being then such mail carrier, was present at said primary taking an active part therein on behalf of said Bynum; that he was peddling tickets for said Bynum, and handed one to this affiant."

One excellent carrier was dismissed on the charge of intoxication. His place was filled by a man who, much of the time for many months, was so far removed from sobriety as to make his delivery of mail a masquerade. The following is a specimen :

"Not long since a letter plainly directed to Ed. E. Schroer, county recorder's

office, was left at the drug store, corner Seventh and Illinois streets, where it remained for several days, and was then returned to the carrier. In a few days it was again returned to the drug store, and it was a week at least before it reached its destination. Then there is complaint that a plainly-printed address, showing the mail was intended for William F. Hensley, 204 College avenue, was left with John H. Hensley, 16 Hall Place, a long distance away from its destination. There has also been mail left at the drug store, as above, equally as plainly addressed to the care of well-known business houses on Washington street, and so it goes."

After this investigation was begun, and it was known to the postoffice authorities that this carrier's peculiarities were the subject of enquiry, he "resigned."

RECAPITULATION.

Unclassified service—former incumbents.....	15
Succeeded by Democrats.....	15
Federal Building, care takers—former incumbents.....	6
Succeeded by Democrats.....	6
Classified service—former incumbents	71
Forced out by Postmaster Jones (all Republicans).....	36
Admitted under competitive system—former incumbents	11
Forced out by Postmaster Jones (included above)	8
Number appointed by postmaster Jones, examined June 10, 1885.....	42
Total number appointed by Postmaster Jones (all Democrats)	43

Length of service of employes forced out of the classified service by Jones so far as I can learn :

3 (3 soldiers) had served about.....	17 years.
2 (2 ") " "	16 "
2 (1 ") " "	13 "
1 (1 ") " "	12 "
2 (1 ") " "	11 "
2 (1 ") " "	10 "
2 (1 ") " "	9 "
1 (0 ") " "	8 "
1 (0 ") " "	7 "
1 (0 ") " "	6 "
3 (0 ") " "	5 "
8 (5 ") " "	4 years or less.
*8 (1 ") " "	2 " " "

* Competitive system.

THE EFFECT UPON THE SERVICE.

There is unquestionably a deep seated belief in Indianapolis that the efficiency of its postoffice has been seriously impaired, and this, in spite of the claim that the "records" show an improvement. The places having been given out as spoils upon the demand of party leaders, or as Mr. Jones and Mr. Dodd express it, upon "pressure," the appointees feel a proportionate independence both of their superiors and of the public. From personal observation and from good authority I believe that the postmaster has not his new appointees in hand. A great number of well authenticated complaints have been made in the public press and continue to be made. Such faults as non-delivery, mis-delivery and slow delivery have prevailed to so wide an extent as to prove beyond question that this postoffice is overburdened with carelessness and inefficiency. Instances have already appeared in this report, and I select also the following :

[From Labor Signal, July 24, 1886.]

"For the reason that the matter has been given a partisan extract by the papers of this city, the Signal has refrained from commenting upon the management of the Indianapolis postoffice, hoping that Mr. Jones would make an effort to correct evils from which the whole community suffers, the existence of which he can not be in ignorance. Every week we have numerous complaints from subscribers who fail to receive their paper, and while we are willing to make all due allowances for oversight on our own part we know that copies of the paper,

plainly addressed, have been found among waste in the basement of the postoffice. Last Saturday no less than a dozen subscribers residing in one neighborhood failed to get the Signal. On Wednesday we mailed additional copies to each one, and up to date they have not been delivered. All this is very exasperating. In the eyes of Mr. Jones and some of his employes the Labor Signal may be of small consequence, but as soon as the postage is paid upon the paper, and it has passed into the custody of the government, it is entitled to as much consideration as the Sentinel or Journal, or any other paper. We have borne this imposition without a murmur for the reason that we did not care to join in the hue and cry against the post-office management. It is a matter of no concern to us whether the office is in Democratic or Republican hands, so long as it is properly conducted."

Number of letters advertised at the dates indicated.

Wildman—1884.	Jones—1885.	Jones—1886.
May.....491	May.....551	May.....685
June.....416	June.....527	June.....656
July.....387	July.....554	July.....685
August.....504	August.....662	August.....583
September.....347	September.....598	September.....550
October.....435	October.....646	
November.....503	November.....752	
December.....400	December.....707	
January.....480	January.....798	
February.....347	February.....485	
March.....384	March.....578	
April.....350	April.....507	

It may be claimed that comparatively few of these letters were called for. They were not, however, advertised steadily in the same paper, but were shifted from one to another until the sixth has been reached, some of these having a limited circulation. Mr. Jones has had an increase of two carriers. This table corroborates the steady complaints of the public.

I quote from the following affidavit:

"Daniel Sellers, being sworn, says he is a member of the firm of Sellers Bros., doing business of peddlers' exchange at Indianapolis, Ind. That said firm hauled waste paper from the Indianapolis postoffice to their place of business several times in 1885; that in August, 1885, while the women in the employ of said firm were sorting said waste paper affiant noticed a draft for about \$1,000 in the pile and another smaller draft, and on examination he found several large packages of unopened letters, and having called up an officer from said postoffice he turned said letters over to him; that said officer cautioned affiant not to say anything about it; that on two other occasions, a month or more apart, affiant found unopened letters in waste paper hauled from said postoffice to said place of business; that about two hundred letters were found the first time and about one hundred the second time and one letter the third time."

Mr. Jones discontinued his sales of waste paper to this firm.

An ex-colonel of the army had occasion to address members of his former regiment, and out of one hundred letters posted thirty-five were returned to him. The persons addressed lived here, but were mostly working men, and not always readily found. Many of the returned letters were delivered by the sender as he met the men on the street.

Under the former administration of this office the mail from the West in the afternoon over the Vandalia Line was delivered the same day, enabling orders to be filled and letters answered for the night mail back. Under Mr. Jones this mail has not been delivered until the next morning. A commercial institution formerly received a daily report from Terre Haute on the last afternoon delivery, but the present postmaster does not deliver it until the following morning. The evils of the reduction of the distributing force to get a salary for the postmaster's son do not appear to have been confined to the needless payment of \$1,500 to him.

These instances could be prolonged indefinitely, but they are best summed up by the long continued open declarations by bankers and business men of want of confidence in the postoffice, and this irrespective of party.

A SINGLE RULE.

The affidavits of the dismissed men from part of which the foregoing extracts are given were not easily obtained. The men who have thus been deprived of their means of living have spoken with reluctance. They are well and favorably known in Indianapolis, and from personal knowledge I can speak highly of their sense of manliness and independence. As a rule, the older of them are efficient and faithful veterans, the younger are clean-handed, intelligent and active, and with each year must have been of greater service to the public—and this applies especially to those who obtained their places under the competitive system. Without a civil-service law the dismissal of these men would have been an injustice to them, and to the public; no matter who succeeds them, the service for a long time is impaired. A good carrier, who has delivered mail five or six years on the same route, can not be succeeded by any inexperienced man, who can get the same mastery of all the details relating to carrying mail on that route in less than a year at least.

It is not meant that no removals could profitably have been made. It is clear that Mr. Jones might have improved the service by the gradual dismissal, for cause, of a few—the highest authority puts the number at six.

We look in vain for any just rule of dismissal governing the postmaster. It has not been a question of improving the service. There was no better employe than Wilmington, whom he discharged among the first, and Fitch, among the last, was the best man but one in his department. No work was ever more faithfully done than by Oakley Johnson in his district, yet the "change" brought on his route Patrick Ward, who had to be taken off from the route because he could not deliver his mail, but who is still kept in the service; and not even a quibble could be raised against McClelland. It has not been personal shortcomings in employes; for, although he dismissed a carrier on a charge of intoxication, yet he put into his place a man well known to yield to that habit, and did not dismiss him, although the condition recurred many times. He also appointed the negro Harrison, and kept him after it was shown that he had offered to sell his services in a political campaign; and still keeps him although he has since been shown, as an attorney, to have shamefully sold out a client for money. It is not a question of discourtesy to the public, for although after sharp criticism by the newspapers he recollected having heard a complaint against Eades, yet he refused even to reprimand George for his ruffianly insolence; and of the rudeness of Kuhn, the successor of Blume, there are many complaints. It is not a question of former partisan admission to the service; for he has dismissed eight of the eleven who had obtained their places under the competitive system, Wood among the first, and Schmedel and Blackledge among the last, all admirable men; while he has appointed House, Kuhn, George, Reed, Cantlin and Darby, who all were active small politicians.

It is not a question of non-partisan conduct in the service, for since his unfounded charges in one case he has not even pretended that partisanship was a reason, and of the great bulk of those dismissed it could not truthfully have been alleged, and he has retained in the service an employe who had been very conspicuous in ward work. And further, he has allowed his own appointees to go to all party lengths in wards, caucuses and conventions.

He once excused his acts in a newspaper interview, saying: "I want to or-

ganize my office though in a way that I will not be required to speak in a whisper while in it. I do not see that *the Democratic party is either advanced or encouraged* by retaining in office a class whose sole duty seems to be in the line of spies and informers." This simply means that to advance the Democratic party the blunders of the postoffice are to be concealed, and it is proved by the fact that when a janitor appointed by him reported the facts to the *Labor Signal*, upon which the above complaints were based, Mr. Jones lectured the janitorial force in the basement upon his requirement that no occurrence in the office should be mentioned outside.

The only rule governing him is to be drawn from his own repeated declarations, and that is the rule of making a vacancy and working a Democrat into it, all in answer to "pressure" by his party politicians who exacted places for relations and workers. In a single year he forced out of the classified service more than half of the original employes, every one of whom was a Republican. Although working under the competitive system he has never appointed a man who was not a Democrat. Doubtless the examination and other records appear regular. But civil service reformers, Republicans and Democrats alike, believe that Mr. Jones and Mr. Dodd have not honestly administered the law.

After the following from the Democratic state organ, the *Indianapolis Sentinel* of July 14, 1886, this statement will hardly be questioned:

"A DIRECT ANSWER."

"The law [the civil service law] says to everybody in our Indianapolis postoffice, for example, 'So long as you honestly perform your duty you shall retain your place.' Has this law been honestly and fairly followed in our postoffice? Let us have a direct answer to this question.—*News*.

"And we answer, no, it has not; it never was, and, until employes of the government cease to identify themselves with the party of power, and cease to obstruct the party of opposition, it never will be, nor ever should be."—*Sentinel*.

Upon his rule Mr. Jones has acted until he has made his office simply a part of the party machine. The competitive system, which before brought in such young men as Wood, Chittenden, Williams, Schmedel and Blackledge, ostensibly now brings in "Pat" Ward, "Jim" George, "Mugwump" Harrison, "Joe" House, and others of like savor.

The list of eligibles is now so arranged that no one not a Democrat can be appointed. The life of the law, confidence that competitors will be fairly dealt with, and that a period of probation and low pay will be followed by a tenure depending upon "efficiency, fitness and devotion to public duty," has been completely destroyed. It would be a waste of time for any one not a Democrat to appear at an examination. And now the postmaster and his friends, when asked why none but Democrats are appointed, answer that no others apply for examination. This is the natural result of entrusting the execution of a reform law to an officer who says publicly, "I despise it." Acting under that feeling, instead of being governed by a high sense of duty as an impartial public officer, the management of this postoffice by Mr. Jones will be a lasting discredit to him.

POSTOFFICES—SECOND CLASS.

These are sixteen in number, and in fifteen the former postmasters have been succeeded by Democrats. In most of these the employes have been almost entirely changed. In several, as Evansville, Fort Wayne, Terre Haute and Lafayette, the number of employes has been increased by one to three. The figures showing former incumbents and their successors include the postmasters:

Evansville—	Former incumbents.....	22
	Succeeded by Democrats.....	20
	Additional Democrats appointed.....	3
Terre Haute—	Former incumbents.....	17
	Succeeded by Democrats.....	17
	Additional Democrats appointed.....	2
Fort Wayne—	Former incumbents.....	17
	Succeeded by Democrats.....	14
	Additional Democrat appointed.....	1
Richmond—	Former incumbents.....	16
	Succeeded by Democrats.....	11
Lafayette—	Former incumbents.....	13
	Succeeded by Democrats.....	13
	Additional Democrat appointed.....	1
South Bend—	Former incumbents..	12
	Succeeded by Democrats.....	11
New Albany—	Former incumbents.....	7
	Succeeded by Democrats.....	6
Logansport—	Former incumbents.....	7
	Succeeded by Democrats.....	6
	Vacancy not filled.....	1
Valparaiso—	Former incumbents.....	6
	Succeeded by Democrats.....	3
	Vacancy not filled.....	1
Vincennes—	Former incumbents.....	5
	Succeeded by Democrats.....	4
Crawfordsville—	Former incumbents.....	5
	Succeeded by Democrats.....	2
Peru—	Former incumbents.....	4
	Succeeded by Democrats.....	4
Madison—	Former incumbents.....	4
	Succeeded by Democrats.....	3
Elkhart—	Former incumbents.....	6
	Succeeded by Democrats.....	5
Laporte—	Former incumbents..	3
	Succeeded by Democrats.....	3

In the Evansville postoffice the money order clerk was dismissed, but had to be recalled because his successor could not fill the place. Some of the carriers dismissed had been carriers since that service was introduced in 1873. In the South Bend office the one employe retained was the daughter of a Democrat. In the New Albany office the one employe retained was a Democrat. In the Peru office the present postmaster notified the former employes through his predecessor to leave with the latter. One new employe is a son and one is a daughter of the chairman of the Democratic committee and who went to Washington and secured the postmaster's appointment. He and his two male employes have been active in primaries and conventions as ticket peddlers and in other capacities, and bestirred themselves especially for a nomination sought by the above named chairman. Postmaster Booe, of Crawfordsville, although appointed some months since, did not take charge of his office until September 1. He has discharged one good clerk, a widow, and appointed to her place a young ward worker, usually as challenger.

POSTOFFICES—THIRD CLASS.

There are seventy-six third class offices, and in sixty-eight the postmasters have been succeeded by Democrats. Attica is one of the remaining eight. The

present postmaster is editor of the *Attica Ledger*, and for several months he has had the names of Blaine and Logan at the head of his columns as candidates for 1888. A majority of the patrons of the office, and the entire bodies of the local Grand Army of the Republic and of the Knights of Labor endeavored to secure the appointment of Martin Schoonover as postmaster. At this juncture Hon. J. E. McDonald made application to have his nephew, George McDonald, appointed. This raised an issue between the citizens of the town and Mr. McDonald, which is not yet decided. In the meantime the former incumbent of the office enjoys the emoluments and labors in the interest of Blaine and Logan.

Another of the eight is the office at Notre Dame. This is held by a priest of the university, and is presumably of their own selection.

The Brazil office is yet unchanged. Two Democrats have applied for it, and it is claimed that both have Mr. Lamb's promise of support in writing. The change dragged, and the Democrats, hoping to hasten it, held an election in March last, five hundred and sixty-five, being nearly all, voting. John J. Lynch was chosen, and Mr. Lamb, then District Attorney, was notified. Lynch never received the office, which, it is claimed, is now promised to another man to be delivered after election.

POSTOFFICES—FOURTH CLASS.

There are about 1,800 of the fourth class offices. The best information I can get indicates that in about 1,200 the postmasters have been changed. This information also indicates that the 600 unchanged offices are not, as a rule, desirable places, being largely cross-roads postoffices. With many of these it has always been difficult to get persons to perform the duties. The emoluments run from \$20 to \$50 a year. Shelby county is an illustration. It has twenty-seven postoffices, of which only nine are changed, but the remainder are such insignificant offices that it would be a matter of considerable time and trouble to replace the present incumbents.

The following are fair instances of the changes:

County.	No. of offices.	Changes.
Wayne	27	18
Tipton.....	13	9
Elkhart	15	14
Gibson	13	11
Morgan.....	20	12
Parke.....	30	24
Vermillion.....	11	9
Scott	9	6
Randolph.....	36	34
Spencer	22	14
Hendricks.....	28	26
Hancock	20	18
Knox.....	16	10
Hamilton	25	19 [Difficult to find available postmasters.]
Sullivan	17	14 [The three holding over are Democrats.]
Putnam.....	26	24 [One remaining incumbent a crippled soldier— Democrats petitioned Congressman Matson to retain.]
Benton	14	13 [Husband of one holding over a Democrat.]

Marshall.....19	16	[The three holding over are Democrats.]
Bartholomew 18	10	[Two holding over are Democrats. For four offices no available Democrats.]
St. Joseph.....15	10	[Remaining offices except one are cross-roads.]
Warren 13	7	[One holding over a Democrat.]
Floyd 8	4	[Three were Democrats. Congressman Howard removed one of these and put in a henchman. Two holding over are women, one an old lady long in service.]
Grant 27	10	[Eight holding over are Democrats, and for two offices no available Democrat.]
Perry.....22	10	[Most of the small offices always held by Democrats.]
Shelby 27	9	[Remaining offices small, hard to fill.]
Starke 12	3	[One holding over a Democrat; has been in fifteen years; other offices small, hard to fill.]
Johnson 17	17	[Possibly a slight error.]
Madison 20	20	" " "
Boone 17	17	" " "
Marion 30	30	" " "
Martin.....11	11	" " "
Rush 17	4	[A notable exception.]

MARSHAL'S OFFICE.

Former incumbents.....	8
Succeeded by Democrats.....	7

PENSION OFFICE.

Former incumbents.....	8
Succeeded by Democrats.....	3
Additional Democrats appointed.....	7

[The system has been changed, and while the number of clerks has been increased, the agent says that the cost to the government is less. The number of pensioners has increased 3,500. Of the medical examining boards two-thirds of the former incumbents seem to have been succeeded by Democrats. The same is believed to be true of the special examiners.]

THE CUSTOM HOUSE AT INDIANAPOLIS.

Former incumbents.....	4
Succeeded by Democrats.....	4

GOVERNMENT DEPOT AT JEFFERSONVILLE.

Former incumbents.....	
Succeeded by Democrats.....	

DISTRICT ATTORNEY'S OFFICE.

Former incumbents..	2
Succeeded by Democrats.....	2

COLLECTORS OF INTERNAL REVENUE.

Indianapolis District.

Former incumbents.....	56
Succeeded by Democrats.....	53
Soldiers formerly employed.....	52
Soldiers now employed.....	4

Kokomo District.

Former incumbents.....	16
Succeeded by Democrats.....	16

Terre Haute District.

Former incumbents.....	22
Succeeded by Democrats.....	22

The Railway Mail Service.

The headquarters of the division embracing Indiana are at Cincinnati, and the routes of the clerks are not limited by State lines. So far as changes have been made the spoils system has been followed and the places not being peculiar to congressional districts, there appears to have been something in the nature of a free-for-all race by congressmen, each getting as many as he could. Congressman Matson boasts that all but two in his share have been put out. This investigation covers only that part of the service running in or through Indianapolis. There are two heavy mail lines running through this city; the Pan Handle line from Pittsburgh to Indianapolis with fifty-five men and the Vandalia line its continuation to St. Louis with forty-nine men, form one; the other is the Kankakee line from Cincinnati to Chicago with thirty-six men. There are nine smaller lines with a total of forty-six men. All of these men except the thirty-six on the Kankakee line are under Chief Clerk Hitt at Indianapolis, and are examined by him. I have applied to Division Superintendent Gwin and Chief Clerk Hitt for exact information as to the number of changes on the above lines, but no replies have been received. Chief Clerk Hitt in conversation stated that of the 150 men under him he thought sixty had been changed. Other authority states that about forty of the former incumbents remain. This is believed to be nearly correct. The service here has been thrown into disorder. Bankers, business men and manufacturers are almost infallible in this matter, and they have for months complained steadily irrespective of party. Out of hundreds of proofs I select a few.

I happened recently to be in the office of a large wholesale firm of this city when the carrier came in with the mail, and the delivery was followed by an irritation now common. I found that a customer at Frankfort, forty miles out, had mailed a registered letter with money and an order for goods. This should have been delivered the next day in time to send the goods to Frankfort the same afternoon. The goods not coming, the customer came down the second morning to see what the matter was, and the letter was not delivered until some hours after his arrival. Large quantities of unworked mail, before rarely seen, have been a daily sight. For instance, on the Vandalia Line, from 40 to 160 sacks of mail have been going into St. Louis four days in the week unworked. And what is without precedent, the Illinois mail from the East has reached Indianapolis with as high as twenty-three sacks unworked. This mail should be worked, and formerly was worked, before reaching Indianapolis. Mail that formerly went into Peoria worked ready to be forwarded on different roads, now goes in a heap to the Peoria postoffice; the delay is evident. In leaving Indianapolis the men are not nimble enough to separate the mail for the first stations, but comparatively large quantities are now carried past to be returned some hours later. Mail plainly directed constantly travels hundreds of miles unnecessarily because the new clerks have not learned their schemes or can not read writing readily. Of other lines running

through Indiana, the Ohio and Mississippi line has carried into St. Louis as high as 119 sacks unworked. And the Wabash line is in equally bad condition. The aggregate of these and similar defects has, since the changes in this service began, grown steadily, until it has become a great public inconvenience, and financially a serious loss.

The railway mail service was possessed of a fine body of trained men, and the service was justly a pride to them and a satisfaction to the public. Its high state of efficiency had been reached in spite of the spoils system and under an extended suspension of its rules. The requirements had become rigid, the examinations were thorough and the officers and men worked with growing reliance upon the public wish that their tenure of place should depend upon fitness and faithfulness alone. The collapse has been complete. These men have here been largely displaced by politicians, who were given their positions as a reward for past or future services to a congressman. They can not do the work, first, because they are without experience, and second, because the bulk of them are inferior men. Formerly a permanent appointment in this division was obtained upon an average of ninety-five per cent. in six examinations during the six months of probation. Now men are appointed permanently after only two examinations, averaging less than ninety per cent. The negro politician, James T. Hill, was one of these. Before about one-half of the probationers failed to reach the standard entitling them to an appointment. Now, although a great number have been recently put on probation, it is a rare occurrence for one to fail. The records of the service will show these facts. This has no reference to those who were probationers March 4, 1885, and who were dropped for political reasons. I can assert, almost without fear of contradiction, that the demoralization of this service is at present beyond control, and this demoralization has not yet reached the highest point; that will be reached when the heavy autumn and winter mails are put upon the cars. There is only one near remedy by which the service could in any considerable degree be restored, and that is the heroic measure of disestablishing the congressmen, of dismissing nine-tenths of their appointees and restoring to the service the trained men who have been put out on various pretexts. In the course of time if the power of congressmen does not prevent the resumption of rigid rules and tests coupled with a weeding out of worthless new appointees the service may be re-taught, *esprit de corp* may return and former efficiency may be restored.

FORMER INCUMBENTS—REMOVALS FOR CAUSE.

In accomplishing removals doubtless the word of a congressman has gone a good way; but it would seem that in most cases he has brought forward evidence. A henchman of his has wanted a place. The place is picked out, a charge is prepared, usually by the henchman, the incumbent is dismissed and the henchman appointed. This has been the course of the bulk of appointments to those places where vacancies have been made for cause. With extremely rare exceptions the accused has not been allowed to see the charges, or to know the names of his accusers. Charges have not been required in all cases. For instance, a postmaster or a revenue collector, having secured his place, has proceeded like a conqueror of a province to clear out those under him and put in his own henchmen or his congressman's henchmen. The foregoing tables show how thoroughly this work has been done. There has been no pretense of a cause.

NEW APPOINTEES—CAUSE FOR REMOVAL.

Before entering into details it is better to note some interpretations by the Administration of the terms "offensive partisanship." Robert L. Taylor was pension

agent at Knoxville, and, being anxious to attend a convention where he expected to be nominated for governor, he wrote, in August last, asking permission to do so. The Administration withheld permission, saying: "While no doubt exists as to your good faith in your proposed action, your presence at the convention will place you and the Administration. if not in a false position, in one subject to mis-construction."

J. B. Hill, marshal of the eastern district of North Carolina, was suspended. Of this Attorney General Garland wrote, July 27, 1886: "I beg leave to say that the President authorizes me to state that such suspension was made for the sole reason that Mr. Hill left his home in Raleigh in 1884, while he was marshal of the United States, and went to the Republican Convention of the First Congressional District—in which he had lived before his removal to Raleigh, but from which he had removed many years since—and by an active canvass succeeded in having himself appointed by said convention in the capacity of delegate, and participated in the proceedings of the same."

With this measure of offensive partisanship in view the following facts should be considered:

CONGRESSMAN HOWARD'S DISTRICT.

Mr. Howard was unfortunate in his distribution of spoils. He appears usually to have settled upon a man for a place, but to have lost nerve at the outcry against the proposed appointment, and then to have shifted to some one else, thereby raising a turmoil which he could not quiet. In consequence, his efforts for renomination were met by open rebellion. He, therefore, was obliged to marshal his place-holders, whom he disciplined by removing a lukewarm Democratic postmaster, and putting in his place a man of more zeal. In a speech, at New Albany, September 23d last, to an audience in which Federal place-holders were a conspicuous element, Mr. Howard denounced civil-service reform in unmeasured terms, and referred to the departments at Washington as places at which no Democrats need apply.

F. M. Stockslager headed the opposition, although he was holding the office of Assistant Land Commissioner at Washington. He worked actively before and at primaries, and participated in an anti-Howard convention, whose congressional nominee he became. He has since, however, withdrawn, but another candidate has been substituted.

Harvey S. Wolf, Corydon, pension examiner, took a very active part in a county convention, making more motions and speeches than any other person present. He was also a delegate to the congressional convention. W. H. Ramsey, postmaster at Ramsey, was recently a candidate for recorder. W. B. Douglas, assistant postmaster at Corydon, was a candidate before the county convention for representative, and defeated. B. K. Gladdon, postmaster at Lexington, is an active politician, and is now a candidate for county auditor. Oscar Allen, postmaster at Brownstown, was recently a candidate for recorder. A. A. Davisson, postmaster, is chairman of the Democratic county committee. Wm. Fultz, postmaster at Crothersville, is member of the Democratic county committee. G. W. Jenkins, postmaster at Crandall, was a delegate to the county convention. M. Hubbard, postmaster at Scottsburg, and mail agent J. A. Miller, Corydon, are reported as continuing active party work. John B. Mitchell, postmaster at New Albany, is a large stockholder in the New Albany Ledger, and I am credibly informed continues actively to shape the course of that paper.

JOHN E. LAMB'S DISTRICT.

John E. Lamb was a candidate for Congress in 1884, and was defeated. He was anxious to be elected to Congress, and, therefore, the General Assembly of 1885 arranged a district for him. His nomination was not desired by the better ele-

ments of his party, but a year ago Senator Voorhees gave notice that the nomination would have to be made. In the meantime he made Mr. Lamb District Attorney. But, on account of the protests of many respectable people, he was never confirmed. The patronage of his district was divided with an eye single to his congressional nomination, more than thirty appointments, aggregating salaries of over \$50,000 having been distributed in Terre Haute alone. Mr. Lamb, though holding his Federal office, attended in person the convention at Rockville which nominated him. Here are other prominent instances of party work in this district :

John F. Regan, postmaster at Terre Haute, has been the chief manager in "setting up" delegations in wards and townships in Mr. Lamb's interest.

John G. McNutt, assistant district attorney, is the secretary of the Vigo county committee. John A. Booe, appointed postmaster at Crawfordsville, was chairman of the county committee. Postmasters Donaldson at Ladoga, Lynch at Darlington, Mitchell at Alino, were all active workers in "setting up" delegations for John E. Lamb. Postmasters Witterwood at Newport, Bell at Eugene, Vansickle at Hillsdale, Edwards at Summit Grove, Brenner at Quaker Hill, and John Redmond and James Chipp, in the revenue service, have been active in party work. D. M. Blue, postmaster at Meron, attended the county and congressional conventions. Postmasters Gravemeier at Dugger, and Snapp at Carlisle, have been active in convention work.

Peter Gfroerer, appointed gauger, was, until the paper stopped publication, two months ago, the editor of the *Terre Haute Banner*.

CONGRESSMAN LOWRY'S DISTRICT.

Mr. Lowry built up a great reputation as a getter of places. It is claimed that he has secured over one hundred. He calls such positions "patronage pie." His course is truthfully indicated by the following extract from an open letter of P. S. O'Rourke :

"* * * * * The Democratic victory of 1884 was not a victory of the Democratic party or its principles; but a victory for spoilsmen, who have resolved themselves in this district into a machine for the support of Mr. Lowry, thus constituting a Lowry party. Postmaster Kaough, instead of employing his time attending to the duties of his office, is looking after the interest of his political master; but not satisfied in doing this in his own county, must go over into Whitley county to assist Postmaster Brown, while both are assisted by two newly appointed mail agents.

"These federal officeholders, with most of the postmasters in this district, managed and manipulated by Mr. Cope, take the various counties in detail, and as the primaries take place in each at a different time, they are able to put their paid army in the field, each soldier of which is made to understand that he is working for his bread and butter. I have some warm friends in the various townships, and in this city, who would be willing to contest, even against such odds; but the struggle is too unequal, and the power of corruption too great for me to allow my friends to fight such a combination, hence I will not be a candidate for the nomination."

I have in attempting to get the names of Federal place holders who have done party work in this district been repeatedly met with the fact that it was a useless labor, because all had been actively thus at work. A reliable correspondent writes, "All the postmasters in the district were either delegates at the convention or were leaders and advisers on the floor of the convention." Another says, "When I say *every postmaster in the district* [was working in the Lowry convention] I mean it literally."

The following are leading examples :

William Kaough, postmaster of Fort Wayne, was the chairman of the Democratic county committee in the campaign of 1884. Since his appointment he has given much of his time to a public participation in political affairs. The day that congressional primaries were held he stood at the polls in Lowry's interest. His carriers were similarly employed. At the convention, though not a delegate, Kaough was recognized as the director of the Lowry men. He also had full charge of naming the delegates in his county, and when adjoining counties held their primaries he went over and took a hand. He was perhaps the most active man in the whole district in securing Lowry's nomination. The superintendent of the government building and his clerk were delegates to the convention.

J. Frank Snyder, postmaster at LaGrange, is the owner of the *Democrat*, and since his appointment has taken in a partner and still edits the paper. This paper in the factional congressional fight has worked in the interest of Lowry. In the county primaries anti-Lowry delegates were chosen for the congressional convention. Mr. Snyder published a card in his paper for another primary which convened. This he attended, and this time delegates favorable to Lowry were chosen. Snyder's wing is known as the postmaster's machine.

James E. McDonald, postmaster at Ligonier, is one of the editors of the *Ligonier Banner*. He is also secretary of the county committee.

The following postmasters, Smith, at Kendallville; Vogeding, at Avilla; Chapman, at Rome City; Borland, at Auburn; Erich, at Spencerville, have been hard at work in primary, convention or otherwise. Eli W. Brown, postmaster at Columbia City, met as a member with the Democratic congressional committee at Fort Wayne, and has been Postmaster Kaough's right hand man in his work for Mr. Lowry. Herman Freygang, postmaster at Angola, also met with the above committee. Kelly, postmaster at Waterloo, in the interest of Mr. Lowry, engaged in a personal encounter at the township convention in March last. C. A. Zollinger, pension agent at Indianapolis, was a member of the Democratic State Committee and continued so for several months. He was also a member of the Democratic congressional committee of Mr. Lowry's district, and met with it as chairman in March last.

CONGRESSMAN MATSON'S DISTRICT.

Mr. Matson was vigorously opposed for re-nomination and it required very earnest efforts by his place holders to secure it. In a speech at a recent convention in Danville he prided himself on having in such a short time removed all but two of the postal clerks in his district, and in having put all of the postoffices into the hands of Democrats except a few not wanted by Democrats.

Postmasters Brown, at Franklin; Calvin, at Nashville; Wilson, at Greenwood; Voyles, at Elizabethtown; Douhost, at Jonesville; Fields, at Spencer; Spellman, at Gosport, were hard workers for him at the convention and before it. Dr. F. A. Schell, a Federal employe at Washington; James R. Fritts, pension agent, headquarters at Chicago, and Frank Duncan, from Terre Haute, left their duties in order to return to work for Mr. Matson. Drs. W. H. Lopp and K. D. Hawley, pension surgeons also, were earnest laborers in this field.

E. W. Callis, postmaster at Martinsville and editor of the *Gazette*, attended the convention. "He wore a Mitchell badge and carried a Mitchell cane and worked for Matson's re-nomination."

Ira Bray, postmaster at Monrovia, is a correspondent of a Democratic newspaper, a member of the Democratic county committee, pays no attention to his office, is now a candidate for county treasurer, and has attended the congressional and judicial conventions and all the primaries of his party.

J. M. Fry, postmaster at Mahalasville, has been a candidate for township trustee and has attended three conventions. Levin Gamble, postmaster at Brooklyn, has attended the congressional and judicial conventions, and is now a candidate for auditor. Levi Paddock, postmaster at Waverly, has attended two conventions and has been a candidate for township trustee. Postmasters Secrist, at Alaska; Rooker, at Mooresville; Richardson, at Centerton; Mannon, at Eminence; Winger, at Wakeland, have attended the congressional and judicial conventions. All the above postmasters are correspondents of some Democratic newspaper.

R. H. Tarleton, pension surgeon, has attended three conventions, and besides been a candidate for mayor of Martiusville, and is now a candidate for county treasurer.

W. L. Cox, pension examiner, is chairman of the Democratic county committee. Henry J. Fettus, postmaster at Bloomington, is the editor of the *Saturday Courier*. Fettus gave as a reason for his appointment as postmaster that it would relieve the Democratic party of the burden of supporting his paper. George E. Finney, postmaster at Columbus, is the editor and proprietor of the *Columbus Daily and Weekly Herald*. W. R. Slater, appointed land agent, was at that time editor of the *Franklin Jacksonian*.

CONGRESSMAN HOLMAN'S DISTRICT.

Mr. Holman found great difficulty in securing a renomination, and therefore in his district also, the party work of place holders centers at the congressional convention. His views are indicated by the fact that he "objected" to the last appropriation to carry out the Pendleton Act.

W. D. H. Hunter, Collector of Internal Revenue, is the editor and proprietor of the *Lawrenceburgh Register*. At the county convention, June 5, he was a delegate, and chairman of the committee on resolutions. At the congressional convention, June 16, he was the most active worker for the renomination of Congressman Holman. He was at Greensburgh before the convention, "setting the pins," and there during the convention as a Holman manager until the close. The delegates appear to have come to the hall headed by Mr. Hunter. In addition he had his deputies, gaugers, and five postal clerks hard at work. Three of these clerks were off duty upon the day of their run.

Storekeepers Miller, Grayson, Billings, Kennedy, White, Gold and Dodd, Gaugers Leibecke, Claypool, Webster and Kellar, Postmasters Huber, at Lawrenceburgh, Jenkins, at St. Paul, Thieband, at Vevay, Egan, at Liberty, Barnett, at Madison; from the revenue service, Gibbs, Armstrong, Captain Rief, and McCullough, E. D. Bannister, Indian agent, Dr. Brandt, Federal placeholder, Doctors J. T. Hitt, W. F. Riley, pension examiners, are some of the placeholding henchmen of Mr. Holman, who, as delegates or workers, insolently and defiantly labored at primary, convention, and elsewhere, to secure the renomination of their patron.

Gold was a delegate to the county convention, and a member of the committee on resolutions. Dodd was a delegate and chairman in the recent legislative convention. Huber, in the county convention, was chairman of the committee on credentials. Thieband has been so much engaged in his political work as to leave his postoffice in the charge of a subordinate. His predecessor, A. E. Shaw, was removed upon a series of charges, part of which were false and the rest trifling deviations from rule. Egan was so ardent a supporter of Mr. Holman as to neglect his office and be offensive to the members of his own party. Barnett was chairman of the Democratic county committee in 1884 and is the owner of the *Herald*. Captain Rief was a delegate and teller at the county convention. Bannister, a member until recently of the Democratic State committee, returned from his Indian agency, and for several weeks journeyed among his old neighbors in the interest of Mr. Holman. He was president of the county convention. Postmasters Buxton, and Zacharias, at Kent, have been active in party work. Zacharias was a delegate to the legislative convention at Brookville.

From four, and as I believe reliable, sources it is stated that from Collector Bishop's district two employes, under the charge of Guager Lemon, came from Cincinnati two days before the convention with a large box. They engaged rooms at the hotel where Congressman Holman was stopping, and set up a bar. One correspondent writes: "Some of my friends visited the room, and they told me it was a first-class bar, with Lemon as barkeeper. * * * They would take delegates that were outspoken Cravens men into the room and in a short time send them out full, and with a Holman badge on them."

CONGRESSMAN BYNUM'S DISTRICT.

Although this district has Federal offices which do not belong exclusively to Mr. Bynum, yet the party work of place holders chiefly relates to him. By no other means could he have secured a renomination. In a speech to the delegates, he said: "I know that the Democrats of Indiana are somewhat lukewarm over the policy of the Administration. I know that they do not indorse the civil-service law as it now exists and is administered, and I fully share in this sentiment." Much of the following work was done under his personal supervision.

AUGUST M. KUHN.

August M. Kuhn was appointed Collector of Customs at Indianapolis on the recommendation of Congressman Bynum. In addition he continues to run a coal

business. He has three deputies, and the following facts show that he has not been or allowed his deputies to be unmindful of Mr. Bynum's interest. Since his appointment he has been a persistent, violent and disreputable party worker, and a most useful tool of his Congressman.

The following is from an affidavit:

"William C. Newcomb, being sworn, says that in the year 1885 he was a Republican member of the Indianapolis Common Council. That he knows A. M. Kuhn, collector of customs at Indianapolis. That, in December, 1885, said Kuhn, being such collector, called upon affiant at affiant's place of business, and stated that he was under obligations to Albert T. Beck, the law partner of Congressman Bynum; that Beck had been very influential in getting him appointed collector of customs, and he wanted to return it by helping Beck get elected city attorney by the council, which election was to take place in a few days. Said Kuhn further told affiant that there was nothing in politics, anyway, except the money a man made out of it, and he offered affiant \$100 if affiant would vote for said Beck, who was a Democrat. That the conversation was then interrupted, and said Kuhn left; in the afternoon affiant went to said Kuhn's office and notified said Kuhn that he would have nothing to do with any such proposition. That the next morning said Kuhn came to affiant again and raised his offer to \$200, and affiant told him for no amount of money could he be induced to dispose of his vote. That said Beck was voted for as such attorney in said council, and was defeated by a small majority."

With regard to the last township election an affiant says that Kuhn was "electioneering and working, and giving out tickets for the Democratic party; that when affiant expostulated with said Kuhn for being an active worker when he was holding a Federal office, said Kuhn laughed and replied that affiant was crazy."

With regard to one of the last congressional primaries an affiant states: "That said Kuhn was present at said primary, taking an active part therein in the interest of W. D. Bynum, making speeches and motions, collecting ballots and so on. That after said primary split said Kuhn remained and helped organize another primary, which elected Bynum delegates; that before said primary was held, for more than a week, said Kuhn was around in said ward, and several times asked this affiant to get up a crowd and come down to said primary to help said Bynum." For several weeks before the primaries Kuhn was around in various wards of Indianapolis endeavoring to secure the election of delegates who would vote for Mr. Bynum's renomination. In saloons and other places he repeatedly offered bets that certain anti-Bynum delegates could not be elected, or that Mr. Bynum would be nominated. He attended the twenty-fourth ward primary with his deputy, Kissel, carrying printed tickets bearing the names of Kuhn, Kissel and Miller. When the meeting became riotous because the ballot box had been stuffed and, after a motion to adjourn, was about to disperse, Kuhn jumped upon a table and shouted, "Don't go boys till you have some beer. I'll set up the beer." The meeting then split, and the Bynum faction declared Kuhn, Kissel and Henry Miller elected. The other faction chose delegates including Thomas Madden.

At the convention May 27, 1886, which followed these primaries Kuhn was present as a delegate and Bynum leader, and was one of the most prominent and noisy in that turbulent meeting. The convention split and made two nominations, Mr. Bynum being one nominee. An interval of wrangling followed, in which Mr. Kuhn bore a conspicuous part, meeting with and stimulating the Bynum faction by act and exhortation, one instance being at Mozart Hall, August 23. It was decided to call the delegates together again, and Kuhn immediately set to work to make proselytes for Mr. Bynum, going from delegate to delegate and soliciting their votes. When the second convention met September 4, last, Kuhn was again present as a delegate, and was the most zealous and prominent supporter of Mr.

Bynum. He promptly led off in smothering any movement not in Mr. Bynum's interest by derisive utterances known in such assemblages as "cat calls," and by other noise and turbulence. His carried his bullying of delegates to the extent that in the interest of Mr. Bynum he was about to engage in a personal encounter with another delegate, but was prevented by bystanders.

The committee on credentials admitted as delegates from his ward Kissel and Miller of one faction, and Thomas Madden of the other, ruling Kuhn out. He paid no attention to this, but continued his proceedings and when the vote of his ward was called delivered it solid for Mr. Bynum. This was corrected, but the collector of customs held on his course to the end.

The question if he was not a Federal office holder was shouted to him across the room and he defiantly shouted back that he was.

KUHN'S DEPUTIES.

Rudolph Mueller was at the congressional primary in the twenty-third ward working for Mr. Bynum, having already canvassed the ward in that interest for several days. He served on a committee on nominations until the meeting split and the Bynum men held a separate primary of which he was secretary. Later he was at a primary to choose delegates to the county convention and was one of the committee on nominations. He was elected delegate.

Peter Carson for two weeks before the congressional primaries was driving around working to secure delegates for Mr. Bynum. He was in a twenty-fifth ward primary making motions and being otherwise active to the same purpose. He was a delegate to both meetings of the convention.

C. Fred Kissel, in addition to his duties as deputy, keeps a saloon. For more than two weeks previous to the congressional primaries one affiant says that Kissel "was constantly around working for said Bynum, and to affiant's question how he could afford to spend so much money, said Kissel replied that it was Bynum's money, or the money of some of Bynum's friends." [Mr. Bynum stated after the first meeting of the convention that it had so far cost him \$1,500, and that he could not afford a further contest.] Kissel, along with Collector Kuhn, was at the twenty-fourth ward congressional primary as secretary of the meeting. He put a handful of the printed Bynum delegate tickets into the ballot-box and was detected as he did it. This broke the meeting in two, and he became secretary of his faction. He was a delegate at both meetings of the congressional convention.

A petition for Kuhn's removal, embodying the facts here stated concerning him and his deputies, has been filed with the President by the officers of the Executive Committee. The President is there referred to the following persons as witnesses, by each of whom one or more of the facts may be shown :

Joseph E. McDonald, ex-Senator, Indianapolis.

William H. English, President First National Bank, Indianapolis.

John P. Frenzel, President Merchants National Bank, Treasurer Democratic State Committee, Indianapolis.

Austin H. Brown, member of the Democratic National Committee, Indianapolis.

Thomas Madden, manufacturer, Indianapolis.

James Renihan, undertaker, Indianapolis.

Michael O'Connor, wholesale grocer, Indianapolis.

A. Kiefer, wholesale druggist, Indianapolis.

John Carlon, printer, Indianapolis.

John W. Kern, Supreme Court Reporter, Indianapolis.

Henry Russe, President German Orphan's Home, Indianapolis.

Joseph W. Pennington, foreman Acme Milling Company, Indianapolis.

Wm. A. Peele, Jr., Chief Indiana Bureau of Statistics, Indianapolis.

William E. English, ex-Congressman, Indianapolis.
 Aquilla Jones, Sr., Postmaster, Indianapolis.
 C. Byfield, lawyer, Indianapolis.
 Dr. C. N. Metcalf, Secretary Indiana State Board of Health, Indianapolis.
 H. C. Newcomb, produce dealer, Indianapolis.
 John Baker, insurance, Indianapolis.
 Philip Zapf, saloon-keeper, Indianapolis.
 Louis Howland, editor of the Freeman, Indianapolis.
 W. P. Fishback, Master-in-Chancery, Indianapolis.
 T. J. McMahan, Cashier Exchange Bank, Anderson.
 John Beggs, distiller, Shelbyville.
 Chas. G. Offut, lawyer, Greenfield, and also
 T. C. Crawford, of the New York World.

JAMES T. DOWLING.

This well-known case is given in detail, as an illustration of the power of a spoilsman. The clerk referred to can secure some votes for his Congressman, and he is, therefore, still kept in service.

James T. Dowling, appointed railway mail clerk by Mr. Bynum, has since headed the delegation from his ward in the convention to nominate Indianapolis city officers. In order to work for the renomination of Mr. Bynum for Congress in the south wards of the city, he left his run May 11, and did not return to it until June 8. He occupied his time in "setting up" delegations. On the night of the primaries he held the meeting for his precinct separate from the balance of the ward. It met early, did up the business sharply, and then went in a body to where the rest of the ward had just begun its meeting, with Col. James H. Rice, Auditor of State, presiding, and created such a riot that Rice declared the meeting adjourned until the next morning. The result was, that while from Dowling's precinct the delegation was uncontested, the disunited parts of the swamped meeting sent contesting delegations to the convention. At the State Convention, August 11, Dowling sat and voted as a delegate, having obtained a proxy. At an adjourned county convention, held August 16, Dowling was present as a worker.

I give other facts illustrative of his conduct as a citizen and public servant:

To W. F. Vilas, Postmaster General:

We, citizens of Indianapolis, who voted for Grover Cleveland for the office of President, respectfully lay before you the following facts:

Early last summer James T. Dowling, of this city, was appointed to the railway mail service, of which service he has been ever since and is now a member. He has been for several years a member of the Common Council of the city of Indianapolis. On and about August 1, 1885, he declared publicly, at different times and places, and in the presence of different persons, that upon a former occasion he had bribed certain of his fellow councilmen. These facts are shown by the following affidavits of William R. Holloway, Scott C. Bone and Marcus L. Brown.

State of Indiana, Marion county, ss:

William R. Holloway, being duly sworn, upon his oath says that he is a resident of the city of Indianapolis, and that he is personally acquainted with one James T. Dowling, now employed in the railway mail service. That on the 1st day of August, 1885, said Dowling declared in affiant's presence that he had bribed certain members of the Common Council of the city of Indianapolis, he being at the time a member of said body, using substantially the following language: "I bought them for the street car company; they were all Republicans; and I want to say to you that I bought 'em God damned cheap." And further affiant saith not.

WILLIAM R. HOLLOWAY.

Subscribed and sworn to before me this 19th day of October, 1885.

[Seal.]

LOUIS HOWLAND, Notary Public.

State of Indiana, Marion county, ss.

S. C. Bone, being duly sworn, upon his oath says that he is a resident of the city of Indianapolis, and that he is personally acquainted with one James T. Dowling, now employed in the railway mail service. That on the 1st day of August, 1885, said Dowling declared in affiant's

presence that he had bribed certain members of the Common Council of the city of Indianapolis, he being at the time a member of said body, using substantially the following language: "I bought them for the street car company; they were all Republicans; and I want to say to you that I bought 'em God damned cheap." And further affiant saith not.

SCOTT C. BONE.

Subscribed and sworn to before me this 27th day of October, 1885.

[Seal.]

LOUIS HOWLAND, Notary Public.

State of Indiana, Marion county, ss:

Marcus L. Brown, being duly sworn, says upon his oath that he is a resident of the city of Indianapolis, Marion county, Indiana, and that he is personally acquainted with one James T. Dowling, now employed in the railway mail service of the government; that on Sunday, the 2d day of August, 1885, at the postoffice in said city, he had a conversation with said Dowling in regard to what he (Dowling) had said the day before about bribing certain members of the Indianapolis Council; that Dowling declared that he wanted an investigation by the grand jury, as he could prove that he had bribed certain Republican members of the Council to vote against the street car ordinance; that when it was said to him that he ought not to make such charges recklessly and without being sure of his proof, he replied that there would be no trouble about proof; that he had it down in black and white; that he had bought several of the Republican councilmen, and that he wanted an investigation by the grand jury so that he could show them up. And further affiant saith not.

MARCUS L. BROWN.

Subscribed and sworn to before me this 28th day of October, 1885. Witness my hand and notarial seal.

[Seal.]

A. W. APPLGATE, Notary Public.

The grand jury of the Criminal Court of Marion county summoned Dowling before them for the purpose of investigating the transactions in bribery upon which he had declared himself as above. Before that body he declined to answer any questions touching the matter, giving as an excuse that he would thereby criminate himself. He was then brought by the Prosecuting Attorney before the acting judge of the Criminal Court upon an information stating the facts and circumstances, and insisting upon his plea of self-crimination, he was, by said judge, excused from answering, and the grand jury was thereby precluded from further investigation of the matter. These facts are shown by the following certified copy of the information and by the affidavit of the Deputy Prosecuting Attorney:

Filed August 6, 1885. M. G. McLAIN, Clerk.

State of Indiana, Marion county, ss:

CRIMINAL COURT OF MARION COUNTY.

Comes now William N. Harding, Prosecuting Attorney for said county and state, and informs the court that James T. Dowling was duly sworn as a witness before the grand jury of said county, and upon being asked the following questions refused to answer them, for the reason that the answer to them might possibly criminate himself, which questions are as follows:

First—Do you know of any money being paid to any member of the Indianapolis City Council for 1882 and 1883, or do you know of any member of said council receiving any money from the Citizens' Street Railway Company to influence him or them to vote in favor of said company on any matter whatever pending before the said council?

Second—Have you any knowledge of any money passing to any member of the Indianapolis City Council for the years 1882 and 1883 from the Citizens' Street Railway Company, or any other corporation, in order to influence his vote on any matter whatever before that council?

Third—Do you know of the Citizens' Street Railway Company of Indianapolis, or any of the agents of that company, paying any money to — Bedford, Ed. Brundage, W. H. Morrison, Peter F. Bryce, Allen Caylor, B. W. Cole, John Egger, Henry Mauer, Nelson Yoke, or any other member of the Indianapolis City Council for the years 1882 and 1883 in order to influence him or them in his or their vote on any matter before the said Council, or any person above named receiving any money from said company?

To which interrogatories the said Dowling refuses to answer, for the reason that it might criminate himself.

WILLIAM N. HARDING,
Prosecuting Attorney.

State of Indiana, Marion County, ss:

I, Moses G. McLain, Clerk of the Criminal Court within and for the county aforesaid, do hereby certify that the foregoing is a full, true and complete copy of the interrogatories propounded to James T. Dowling before the grand jury of said county, and of his reason for refusing to answer them or any one of them, as appears from an original paper signed by the Prosecuting Attorney, William N. Harding, filed in my office on August 6, 1885, and now in my custody and keeping.

In testimony whereof I hereunto subscribe my name and affix the seal of said Criminal Court, at my office in the city of Indianapolis, the 18th day of September, 1885.

[Seal.]

MOSES G. McLAIN,
Clerk of the Criminal Court of Marion County, Ind.

State of Indiana, Marion County, ss:

Joseph B. Kealing, being sworn, says that he is and has been for more than six months last past Deputy Prosecutor of said county; that he was present when the information of which the foregoing is a copy was laid before the acting Judge, Ross Clark, of the Criminal Court of

said Marion county, in chambers, and that the Court, after considering the same, excused James T. Dowling, mentioned therein, from answering the questions therein set forth, on the ground of said Dowling's plea that he might criminate himself, and the investigation by the grand jury was therefore brought to a close.

JOSEPH B. KEALING.

Subscribed and sworn to before me this the 17th day of October, 1885.

[Seal.]

MOSES G. McLAIN,
Clerk of the Criminal Court of Marion County.

The Common Council then proceeded to determine whether Dowling had made the declarations ascribed to him of bribing his fellow members, and by a vote of 17 to 3 that body, after full investigation, decided that he had made such declarations. The Council then proceeded to vote upon the expulsion of Dowling, and upon this vote 13 were in favor of his expulsion and 7 were against it; only one vote of the necessary two-thirds was lacking. These facts are shown by the following certified copy of the proceedings of the Common Council:

In the matter of the trial of Councilman James T. Dowling:

At a special meeting of the Common Council of the city of Indianapolis, Ind., held in the council chamber on Monday evening, September 28, 1885, the following, among other proceedings, were had: The Common Council proceeded with the consideration of the charges heretofore preferred against Councilman James T. Dowling, which charges are as follows, viz:

To the Hon. John L. McMaster, Mayor, and the Members of the Common Council of the City of Indianapolis, except James T. Dowling:

GENTLEMEN—The undersigned, members of the Common Council of the city of Indianapolis, and composing a majority of the special committee appointed by said Council to make inquiry into certain matters touching the character of James T. Dowling, a member of this body, and challenging his fitness to longer sit as a member thereof, after due inquiry and consideration, present and charge: That said Dowling has been guilty of conduct unbecoming a gentleman and a member of this body, in this, to wit:

First—That said Dowling on, to wit, the 1st day of August, 1885, while a member of the Common Council of the city of Indianapolis, did publicly charge, state, proclaim and admit, in the presence of various citizens in said city, that he, said Dowling, did bribe, corrupt and buy certain members of the Common Council of said city for the years 1882 and 1883, by paying them money and giving them other things of value, to vote for certain measures and against certain other measures then pending in and before said council.

Second—That said Dowling on, to wit: the 1st day of August, 1885, while a member of said council, did publicly charge, state and proclaim, in the presence of numerous citizens in the city of Indianapolis, that he, said Dowling, did bribe, corrupt, and buy, certain members of the Common Council of the said city for the years 1882 and 1883, by paying them money and giving them other things of value to vote for certain measures and against certain other measures then pending in and before said council, all of which said charges, statements and proclamations were false.

Third—That said Dowling on, to wit: the 2d day of August, 1885, while a member of said council, did publicly reiterate, repeat, charge, state and proclaim in the presence of numerous other citizens of said city of Indianapolis, that he, said Dowling, did bribe, corrupt and buy, certain members of the Common Council for the years 1882 and 1883 by paying them money and giving them other things of value to vote for certain measures and against certain other measures then pending in and before said council, and did then and there further state that he had proof thereof in writing that all such statements were true, whereas all such statements were untrue and false.

Wherefore they ask that said Dowling be expelled.

W. C. NEWCOMB,
PRESTON C. TRUSLER,
Majority of Committee.

The following persons were sworn as witnesses and examined: W. R. Holloway, M. L. Brown, H. J. Mauer, A. W. Johnson, John Egger, C. T. Bedford, M. D. and Allen Caylor. The Chair then announced that the roll would be called on the charges in the order as presented, and the councilmen should answer as their names are called, "guilty" or "not guilty."

The roll was then called and a vote had on each specification of the charges, the vote in each case resulting as follows: Those who voted guilty were Councilmen Benjamin, Edenharter, Gallahue, Haugh, Mack, McClelland, Newcomb, Pearson, Rees, Reinecke, Reynolds, Smither, Spahr, Thalman, Trusler, Wharton and Wolf—17. Those who voted not guilty were Councilmen Coy, Curry and Doyle—3.

The several charges having been sustained, the chair then put the question as to the expulsion of Councilman Dowling. Those voting for his expulsion are as follows: Councilmen Benjamin, Gallahue, Haugh, McClelland, Newcomb, Pearson, Rees, Reynolds, Smither, Spahr, Thalman, Trusler and Wharton—13. Those voting against his expulsion are as follows: Councilmen Coy, Curry, Doyle, Edenharter, Mack, Reinecke and Wolf—7.

The statute requiring "that any member of the common council may be expelled or removed from office by a two-thirds vote," the chair declared the accused as not expelled, not having received the necessary number of votes. [Total number of councilmen 25.]

OFFICE OF CITY CLERK,
INDIANAPOLIS, INDIANA.

I, George T. Breunig, Clerk of the city of Indianapolis, do hereby certify that the above and foregoing statement of the action had by the common council of said city in the trial of charges against James T. Dowling is true, as appears by the record now on file in my office.

Witness my hand and the seal of the city of Indianapolis this 16th day of October, 1885.
[Seal.]

GEO. T. BREUNIG, City Clerk.

Applying the principles common among honorable business men, this man can not, without violence to those principles, be longer retained in the service of the people. No sound business man would retain an employe who declared that he had cheated a former employer. The people demand that the same rule shall be applied to their business, and that no man who publicly boasts that he has cheated them, and has become a criminal by bribing their representatives, shall ever again have confided to him a public trust. We therefore ask that James T. Dowling be dismissed from the public service.

LUCIUS B. SWIFT.
ALEXANDER METZGER.
LOUIS HOWLAND.
ARTHUR A. MCKAIN.
LINDLEY VINTON.

Indianapolis, Ind., Oct. 28, 1885.

The Postmaster General refused to consider the above evidence as sufficient, but relied on the secret opinion of eminent Democrats who said that they had great confidence in Dowling. The danger of such reliance was a little later shown :

We, the undersigned, would most earnestly request of the proper person for making the appointment, to appoint Bernard Conroy to the position of transfer agent for transferring the mails at the Union Depot, Indianapolis. We have known Mr. Conroy for a long time as an earnest worker in the cause of Democracy—one who is always at the polls early and late. He is a hard-working, honest citizen, and as he has never before asked an appointment, we think him worthy of recognition now.

Isaac P. Gray, Governor; Oscar B. Hord; John J. Cooper, Treasurer of State; S. P. Sheerin, Clerk of the Supreme Court; W. E. Niblack, Supreme Judge.

James H. Rice, Auditor of State; Francis T. Hord, Attorney-General; W. R. Myers, Secretary of State.

Conroy was appointed by Mr. Bynum to the railway mail service. He had served two terms in prison, being sent from Indianapolis, where he had been for many years a conspicuous object in police circles and in the criminal court, having been eleven times in jail on criminal charges. When appointed he was in the employ of Mr. Bynum's chief henchman, Frank Creelman.

To return to Dowling, he has repeatedly entered upon his duties more or less intoxicated, and several times could not go on duty because in that condition. Since entering the service he has been promoted. He has considerable natural capacity. As a mail clerk he is a masquerader. Sometimes he does not put off mail at a place; sometimes he does not take it on; sometimes he gives the mail of one town to another, and the latter's mail to the former. On one trip he scarcely put off or took on mail between Indianapolis and Crawfordsville, there being eight stations. In a single month recently he was checked for 300 errors. A good clerk would have been disgraced by fifty. It can be safely asserted that he made 1,000 errors in a single week.

Dowling's predecessor was John Baker, from whose affidavit I quote :

"John Baker, being sworn, says that he is forty-nine years old. That he served in the twelfth infantry and twelfth artillery, New York regiments, about three and one-half years, and was twice wounded. That he was appointed railway mail clerk in 1874, and served eleven years, being dismissed May 11, 1885, on a charge which was true, that he had had charge of the artillery during the reception of Blaine

and Logan, at Indianapolis, in the preceding Presidential campaign. That while he was in the civil service his party work consisted in twice having charge of artillery on public occasions, in the day time, and in peddling tickets at various times at the polls, and in talking freely. That in his eleven years of service he never was a challenger, or member of a committee, or a delegate, or one of an election board, or a "setter up" of primaries. That the things he has mentioned as having done, except talking, he did exclusively those weeks when he was off his run, as entitled to be by the rules of the service. That during his eleven years of service he never missed a 'run' or failed to answer a call for an extra 'run,' except for seven weeks in 1882, when disabled by a railway accident, except, also, six weeks when he resigned and was re-appointed. That his work has always been upon the heaviest lines, and his errors averaged from twenty to thirty-five monthly. That, in 1876, he ran on the fast mail leaving Cincinnati at two o'clock in the morning and reaching Indianapolis at five. That his work on that train was such as to draw forth to Mr. French, division superintendent, an expression of satisfaction from the Enquirer, Commercial and Volksblatt, of Cincinnati, and for this work his pay was raised from \$1,000 to \$1,100 a year.

"That during the campaign of 1884 James T. Dowling, who has since succeeded this affiant, notified him that in case of Democratic success he would cut off affiant's head, meaning thereby he that he would secure affiant's dismissal from the service, which he did."

O. T. Wells, appointed railway mail clerk upon the recommendation of Mr. Bynum, became, after noisy work at the primary, a delegate to a township convention. He was off his run May 24, 25, 26, 27 and 28, during which time he was busy in the eleventh ward endeavoring to secure a delegation including himself for Mr. Bynum. In this he was very conspicuous, driving about in a buggy and diligently hustling. On the night of the primary he brought people there in hacks to vote for the Bynum candidates; he made all the motions and was the general manager for that faction. When defeated, Wells called another meeting, and got up a contesting delegation, which was denied admittance to the convention.

R. P. Corey, appointed railway mail clerk upon the recommendation of Mr. Bynum, was off duty for some time, working in Lawrence township, Hancock county, to get up a delegation for Bynum. Richard Mustard, also railway mail clerk by the same influence, was off duty two days, and was a loud worker for Mr. Bynum on the floor of the congressional convention. Philip H. Wolf, Charles H. Rogers and Eugene Lewis, Bynum railway mail clerk appointees, were off duty May 26 and 27, working for his renomination. Lewis spent the entire day at and around the polls. Philip Doyle and John Payne, in the same service by the same influence, were off duty for the same purpose. Wolf and Doyle who, it is well to remember, had supported Mail Clerk Dowling when accused in the Indianapolis council, were defeated for delegates to Mr. Bynum's convention, also Timmons and Hick, other Bynum railway mail clerks.

W. P. Canfield, postmaster at Haughville, was a delegate to the Bynum convention. Postmasters Major, at Shelbyville, Avery, at New Augusta, Campbell, at Anderson, Parkhurst, at Fairland, are other instances of Federal place holders conspicuously working for Mr. Bynum's renomination; as are also Willis McGinnis, defeated for delegate, Benjamin Wadsworth, and Joseph Lacey, all in the revenue service, and Postoffice Inspector Stewart, all Bynum appointees.

Smith H. Myers, superintendent of mails in the Indianapolis postoffice, took part in a Democratic primary August 9. He has, of late, been active in the support of Mr. Bynum, attending a meeting of the Bynum faction at Mozart hall, speaking there, and being zealous in other places.

Henry Miller; as we have seen, was at the twenty-fourth ward primary with Kuhn and Kissel. Being in debt, he went, before the meeting, to his creditor, a

Republican, and asked him to come to the primary and help "set up" Bynum delegates. He held out that if successful he would get an appointment in the railway mail service, and could pay his debt. The Republican complied. Bynum delegates were, in a manner, chosen, and Miller has received his appointment. In part of his work, before the primary, he was accompanied by Congressman Bynum in person.

J. T. Hill, postal clerk, is member of a negro political club and an active politician, having in the township election been a ticket peddler.*

Edward Hawkins, appointed United States Marshal, was one of the Democratic State Committee, and continued so for several months. At the State convention, August 11, he, with his deputy Taylor, worked diligently for the nomination of Martin Kreuger. Kreuger and Mr. Hawkins are from the same county. He also took part in a political meeting September 27, his deputies, Stein and Taylor, marching with a political club to the same meeting. J. L. Reiley is a clerk in the pension office, and was, until recently, secretary of the Democratic State Committee, as such signing a call to that committee July 24, 1886. Jacob Deitzer, deputy collector, is foreman of the Shelbyville *Democrat*. L. Baring, postmaster at Carrollton, has, since his appointment, been a candidate for a county office. He left his postoffice for several weeks while he electioneered. Jesse J. Jackson, postmaster at McCordsville, is a member of the Democratic County Committee. Albert Pogue, postmaster at Mount Comfort, is charged with fighting and rioting at the township election in 1886.

OTHER DISTRICTS.

Norval Blackburn, postmaster at Decatur, is the editor of the *Democrat*. He has removed his newspaper office into the same building, and on the same floor as the postoffice. He is also the secretary of the Democratic county committee, and was an alternate at the State convention August 11.

D. J. Eastburn, postmaster at Fowler, is the editor of the *Benton Review*. He continues to be an active politician, and August 11 he attended a convention at Goodland.

Dr. H. C. Davisson, pension examiner, is the regular correspondent from Hartford City for the *Cincinnati Enquirer*; also, occasionally for the *Indianapolis Sentinel*. He was at the State convention August 11.

A. B. Crampton, postmaster at Delphi, is the editor and proprietor of the *Times*. He was a member of the Democratic State committee in 1884, and an active politician otherwise.

B. F. Louthain, postmaster at Logansport, was chairman of the Democratic county committee in 1884, and was also the editor of the *Pharos*. I am credibly informed that he still secretly edits that paper.

W. H. Norton, postmaster at Elkhart, is the owner of the *Sentinel*.

John M. Higgs, postmaster at Connersville, is the editor of the *Examiner*. He also continues to be active in all the other party work of the primary and convention.

A. T. Bitters, postmaster at Rochester, was the owner until May, 1886, of the *Sentinel*.

W. H. Evans, postmaster at Princeton, is the editor of the *Democrat*, and has continued to be active in all other party work. He was chairman of the committee on rules in the McCullough convention, attended the convention July 15, as a member of the congressional district committee. His view is shown in the following from his paper:

"We can understand why Republicans might engage in such contemptible business; but for men claiming to be good Democrats to prefer charges of offensive partisanship against a Democrat for attending and taking part in Democratic conventions is hard to understand. It is "littleness whittled down to a fine point."

*Since this report was in type Scott Turner, a negro politician, president of a political club, has been appointed by Mr. Bynum to the railway mail service. His judgment in refusing a place in the bag department under Postmaster Jones because "not good enough," is thus vindicated. It would seem too that Mail Carrier Harrison's efforts with negro voters are receiving substantial support.

Upon which the *Vincennes News* (Dem.) remarks:

"In his frequent utterances relating to offensive partisanship Mr. Cleveland did not limit its application to Republicans. We took it that the President meant what he said, and that it was just as reprehensible in a Democrat to violate the law and orders of his superiors as in a Republican. It is possible that Mr. Cleveland really did not mean that his definition of offensive partisanship should cover Democrats who took active part in party work, but we have preferred to believe him honest and sincere, and our actions have been on this assumption."

Albert A. Sparks is the editor of the *Democrat*, and upon assuming the duties of postmaster the following notice appeared in his newspaper, with a conspicuous heading.

NOTICE.

Having assumed the duties of postmaster of this city of Mount Vernon, Ind., it will be necessary for me to remain in the postoffice during business hours, therefore, persons desiring to see me on special business connected with the *Democrat* will please call at the postoffice.

July 16, 1886, a petition signed by John R. Gardiner, S. H. Pierce, James T. Welborn, Silas P. Jones, E. E. Thomas, prominent Democrats, praying for the removal of Mr. Sparks, because as a Federal office holder he had used his position to dictate the political action of his party associates and to throttle their freedom of action within party lines, was sent to the Postmaster General, and Jacob Harlem, Charles M. Spencer, James Kilroy and Isaac Lawrence were cited as witnesses.

John O. Henderson, revenue collector, retains his large interest in the *Kokomo Dispatch*, and I am informed continues his editorial work. He was at the state convention August 11.

H. E. Wadsworth, postmaster at Laporte, was and is the editor of the *Argus*.

A. J. Kitt, postmaster at Goodland, is the owner and publisher of the *Herald*. His predecessor says he got her removed on the false charge that she was a non-resident.

W. L. Underwood, postmaster at Cannelton, is the editor and proprietor of the *Enquirer and Reporter*. He takes an active part in all meetings of committees and caucuses. He was secretary of the McCullough convention. The chairman whom he nominated appointed him on the congressional district committee. He attended that convention as a committeeman of Perry county.

Thomas J. Leamans, postmaster at Wabash, is a stockholder in the *Wabash Times*, and continues other party work. D. T. Krisher, postmaster at North Manchester, was, at the time of his appointment, the editor of the *Wabash Times*, and still owns stock in the paper. He continues to be active otherwise in politics.

William Swint, postmaster at Booneville, is the editor of the *Enquirer*. He acted as secretary of first convention, and was put on the congressional district committee. He was very active in "setting up" Warrick county for Mr. McCullough, congressional nominee.

B. F. Binegar, postmaster at Albany, presided at a township primary.

James H. Quillen, postmaster at Lyons, was a delegate at a convention in June. Mr. Quillen uses a postoffice letter-head containing his address and official title, and also the pictures of Cleveland and Hendricks. Under the pictures is the legend, "Our benefactors."

J. H. Organ, deputy collector, was a delegate to the state convention August 11.

J. B. Ruger, postmaster at Lafayette, has presided at a convention, and continues active party work.

G. W. Welker, postmaster at Centerville, was a delegate to the state convention August 11.

J. H. Macke, deputy revenue collector, was the chairman of the Wayne county committee in 1884, and was a delegate to the state convention August 11.

John Holland, a Richmond letter carrier, was a delegate to the state convention August 11.

L. Mehlig, postmaster at Sharpsville, is a member of a Democratic committee.

William Wilson, deputy postmaster at North Manchester, is chairman of the Democratic county committee.

Oliver C. Cook, postmaster at Green's Fork, is a member of the Democratic county committee.

I. R. Thomas, postmaster at Fountain City, is a member of the Democratic county committee.

George W. Duke, deputy revenue collector, was chairman of the Democratic county committee in 1884, and about July 22 called the Democratic county convention to order as chairman. He was vice-president of a political meeting September 27 last.

A. A. Davisson, postmaster at Seymour, is Chairman of the Democratic district central committee.

Willam Fultz, postmaster at Crothersville, is a member of the Democratic county committee.

James C. Carlton, postmaster at Bedford, is a member of the Democratic county committee.

R. M. Roberson, postmaster at Tipton was chairman of the Democratic county committee in 1884, and still holds that office.

Oscar Allen, postmaster at Brownstown, was a candidate before a convention for recorder.

B. S. Gray, son of the Governor, was the editor of the *Sun*, and was appointed postmaster as I am informed against the wishes of the citizens. He is an absentee from his office a large part of the time, and is an active politician at all caucuses and conventions.

George B. Cobb, a son of Congressman Cobb, was at the time of his appointment as clerk of the Land Commissioner, a reporter for the Vincennes *Sun*.

J. D. Armstrong, deputy revenue collector, was at the time of appointment the editor and proprietor of the *Sentinel*.

James Elder was publisher of the Richmond *Democrat*, and appointed postmaster. Soon after his appointment he died, and his son succeeded him.

L. A. Kirkwood, postoffice inspector, was when appointed editor and proprietor of the Muncie *Democrat*.

James E. Kackley, postmaster at Vincennes, continues to be an active politician. He attended the State convention, August 11, as a zealous worker for Reiter, a candidate for nomination. The following charges of offensive partisanship have been filed against him by some civil-service reform Democrats of his town :

VINCENNES, IND., August 12, 1886.

To the Hon. W. F. Vilas, Postmaster General, Washington, D. C. :

We, the undersigned, citizens of the city of Vincennes, Indiana, hereby most respectfully prefer and make the following charges against James E. Kackley, postmaster of said city, towit :

1. He did absent himself from said office and from said city on the following days : Saturday, August 7, Sunday, August 8, Monday, August 9, Tuesday, August 10, and Wednesday, August 11, 1886.

2. He did, on the 7th day of August, 1886, at Petersburg, Pike county, Indiana, where he had gone for that purpose, take part in a political convention, composed of delegates from the counties of Knox and Pike, and held for the purpose of nominating a candidate for State Senator from said counties.

3. He did, on Sunday, August 8, 1886, go to Indianapolis, Indiana, where he remained until the following Wednesday or Thursday, and took an active part in the Democratic State Convention and attended and took part in various preliminary meetings and caucuses incident to the convention. He had, prior to that time, procured for himself a written proxy from one Thomas Robertson, a duly appointed delegate from Knox county to said convention, and said Kackley acted as a delegate therein and was active in working for and against candidates before said convention.

We most respectfully submit that said acts and each of them are in violation of the laws of the United States, the rules of your department and the orders of the President. We pray that said charges be investigated, and, if found to be true, that said Kackley be dismissed from said office.

In support of the first charge we ask that the following witnesses be examined : Frank Reiter, Joseph Boseman, Theodore S. Love, Helen Holland, Mason J. Niblack and William A. Cullop.

In support of the second charge we ask that the following witnesses be examined : Newton F. Malott, R. E. Purcell, George R. Alsop and Henry S. Cauthorn, of Vincennes, Ind., and Jefferson Lytton, of Wheatland, Ind.

In support of the third charge we ask that the following witnesses be examined : Orlan F. Baker, Dexter Gardner, Harry V. Somes, Wm. B. Robinson, John Duesterberg, Thomas Robertson and Thomas R. Cobb, of Vincennes, Indiana.

We further submit herewith marked copies of various newspapers in this State for the purpose of showing that the facts herein stated are well known.

Respectfully submitted,

SAMUEL W. WILLIAMS,
WARREN W. BAILEY,
CHRISTIAN HOFFMAN,
WILLIAM BAKER,
JOSEPH A. SWARTZEL,
JOHN A. RANDOLPH,
CHARLES M. WETZEL.

Postmasters Crane at Locke, Casteller at Waterford Mills, Shaw at Kingsbury, McCormick at Union Mills, Sharpless at Rolling Prairie, Hale at La Fontaine, Hatton at Williamsport, Steinspring at Marshfield, Morple at State Line, Gehris at Walnut Grove, White at West Lebanon, Dale at Monticello, were active politicians when appointed, and have continued to be active politicians since.

Postmasters West at Millersburg, Stoutnour at New Paris, Long at Benton, Hoover at Middlebury, Milrin at Wakarusa, Smith at Vistula, Nicholson at Bristol, Eby at Nappanee, Overman at Marion, O'Donnell at Mitchell, Baker at Winamac, and Guager Shanks of Lawrence county, have been active workers either in primaries or at conventions, and in most cases at both.

It is reported to me that in the counties of Clinton, Dubois, Henry, Huntington, Jasper, Ohio, Randolph, St. Joseph and Wells, Federal place holders have abstained from party work.

The following is a list of Federal employes who at the time of their appointment were connected with a Democratic newspaper as editor, proprietor or stockholder, and with possibly eight exceptions some such relation still continues:

James Elder, postmaster, Richmond.
 W. H. Norton, postmaster, Elkhart.
 D. Krisher, postmaster, North Manchester.
 E. Copner, postmaster, Waynetown.
 B. S. Gray, postmaster, Portland.
 T. J. Leamans, postmaster, Wabash.
 D. J. Eastburn, postmaster, Fowler.
 W. Swint, postmaster, Booneville.
 A. J. Kitt, postmaster, Goodland.
 J. E. McDonald, postmaster, Ligonier.
 J. F. Snyder, postmaster, LaGrange.
 A. B. Crampton, postmaster, Delphi.
 H. J. Fettus, postmaster, Bloomington.
 H. E. Wadsworth, postmaster, Laporte.
 W. A. Barnett, postmaster, Madison.
 W. H. Evans, postmaster, Princeton.
 A. A. Sparks, postmaster, Mount Vernon.
 B. F. Louthain, postmaster, Logansport.
 Stephen Belding, postmaster, Washington.
 A. T. Bitters, postmaster, Rochester.
 E. W. Callis, postmaster, Martinsville.
 J. M. Higgs, postmaster, Connersville.
 G. E. Finney, postmaster, Columbus.
 W. L. Underwood, postmaster, Cannelton.
 Norval Blackburn, postmaster, Decatur.
 J. B. Mitchell, postmaster, New Albany.
 J. O. Henderson, internal revenue, Kokomo.
 W. D. H. Hunter, internal revenue, Lawrenceburgh.
 J. D. Armstrong, internal revenue, Rockport.
 Peter Gfroerer, internal revenue, Terre Haute.
 M. R. Slater, land agent, Franklin.
 L. A. Kirkwood, postoffice inspector, Muncie.
 B. W. Hanna, foreign minister, Crawfordsville.
 J. S. Williams, third auditor of the treasury, Lafayette.

PARTISANSHIP OF PLACE HOLDERS SINCE JULY 14, 1886.

On the above date the President issued his order warning place holders to refrain from partisan activity. This order has secured slight obedience. To make this clear, in addition to instances already given I select from Morgan county regarding a county convention held August 19, 1886.

Bray, postmaster at Monrovia, was present, and changed his candidacy from

county treasurer to commissioner ; was nominated and is working for his own election.

Frey, postmaster at Mahalasville, was present, and for a time was candidate for county clerk.

Rooker, postmaster at Mooresville, was present, and successfully worked for Richardson for clerk.

Gamble, postmaster at Brooklyn, was present and successfully worked for his township man for auditor.

Dr. R. H. Tarlton, pension surgeon, was present, taking his usual active part.

Dr. S. A. Tilford, pension surgeon, was present and was a prominent leader in a factional fight in the convention. He was charged with being "the leader of a ring at Martinsville, who was trying to control everything."

E. W. Callis, editor and postmaster at Martinsville, was not at the convention in person, but sent representatives, and has lately been doing his party work by deputy. He devotes, however, little time to his postoffice, but attends to his newspaper.

To these should be added the following placeholders, previously mentioned in this report: Norval Blackburn, Lewis Douhost, D. J. Eastburn, H. C. Davisson, W. Zacherias, James E. Kackley, J. H. Organ, J. W. Welker, J. H. Macke, John Holland, Joseph Sheppard, Smith H. Myers, John Van Stan, J. T. Dowling, A. M. Kuhn, C. F. Kissel, Rudolph Mueller, Peter Carson, Edward Hawkins and his deputies, Stein and Taylor, J. O. Henderson, Dennis Colbert, G. W. Duke, John W. Leach, John W. Dodd, Alfred Harrison, J. T. Hill, Rev. O. H. P. Abbett.

THE COURSE OF ADMINISTRATION.

Taking the State as a whole, in a year and a half, with unimportant exceptions, the Federal employes have been displaced by a new set. In May last Judge Lewis Jordan, a prominent and well-informed Democrat, said, in the Indianapolis Sentinel: "Why should there be any dissatisfaction in Indiana when all the Federal officers in the State, save a few postmasters, have been changed? * * * In some of the congressional districts there is not a Republican postmaster left." At the State convention, August 11, last, R. W. Miers was nominated for Secretary of State. In his speech of acceptance he said: "Notwithstanding it (the Administration) has been hampered by the civil-service law, the rascals are nearly all out." And ex-Senator McDonald, in a recent interview, said: "Our State is thoroughly satisfied as far as Federal patronage is concerned."

Employes, whose aggregate wages amounted to a very large sum, have been deprived of their places and in large numbers are now seeking other employment. Untrained men have been hired by the government to do their work. For party objects the new men were taken from the party workers ; they were, when appointed, offensive partisans of the ultra type. Congressmen have chosen from the worser elements of their party. The general wrangle with which the changes have been made is an unhappy public sight. The public business has been hampered. It brings the whole case vividly to mind to ask, if a long-suffering people is to be called upon to repeat this experience, now lasting a year and a half, in the first part of another Presidential term should another party come into power at the end of four years? Congressmen, to an extent never exceeded, have attempted to keep their places by giving places to others. The opposition to a number of congressmen was in each case nearly overbalancing, and the work of Federal placeholders was the single weight that turned the scale. Having had their way, these political sharpers seek to hide the ignominy thus heaped upon a reform Administration by breaking out into loud praises of the President. Mr. Bynum, patronizingly to his convention, says: "No more devoted patriot, sincere and honest official than Grover Cleveland ever filled, in my judgment, the executive chair." Voorhees,

Holman, Matson and Lowry, all fresh from throttling the will of the people, are "surprised" to find how strong the President is.

When I look at the appointees I can but conclude that charges of offensive partisanship have been largely, so far as congressmen and those making them are concerned, a pretence only; everything has bent to the exigencies of congressmen. For instance, Postal Clerk Steinhauer, at Indianapolis, was dismissed for having while in the service gone to Cincinnati and acted as deputy marshal at the State election in 1884. He was a hard working, efficient clerk. He went to Ohio by order of his superiors. His successor, Conroy, was found too unsavory to keep. Baffled in rewarding Conroy, Mr. Bynum could not at once allot this spoil, and Steinhauer was put back and borne with over six months until it suited the purpose of Mr. Bynum to turn him out again; this he did, and put in Miller, to pay for what Miller did for Mr. Bynum's renomination, and of which I have already spoken.

The treatment has not been even handed. Very few men could get any information whatever as to their removal, and a hearing was universally refused. Yet in the Dowling case the matter was referred to Mr. Bynum, and Dowling was given the fullest opportunity to answer, the Postmaster General writing:

"It is fair to any man who has been appointed and since his appointment has continued in the service without complaint as to the manner of its performance from the officials over him that he should have notice of such an accusation as you make, because inquiry might put a different complexion upon the case as you understand it."

And the names of those who secretly answered for him were refused to those who publicly made the charges.

Again, Isabella De La Hunt, widow of a Democrat who died of wounds received in the service, held the postoffice at Cannelton. She was removed for alleged partisanship, first located in the campaign just closed. This had no foundation, and it was then laid upon editorials printed more than eight years before in a paper owned but not edited by her, and soon after sold. Her successor is the editor of a paper, was delegate and secretary in a recent congressional convention, cast the vote of his township for one man, although the delegates had been instructed to vote for another, and was made one of the congressional committee.

Again, the postmaster at Martinsville was dismissed because he owned and edited a paper. His successor, E. W. Callis, editor of the *Martinsville Weekly Gazette*, supported his application by the following editorial from his paper of February 14, 1885:

"CITY AND COUNTY."

"The editor of this paper is a candidate for postmaster of the city of Martinsville, and he thinks that he ought to be successful. In fact he has been a standing candidate for a number of long years contingent upon the success of the Democratic party in a national election. Since that point has been reached, he has a right to expect that party pledges and promises should be redeemed. He expects the support of all Democrats who are connected with this party programme. He expects the support of all Democrats who believe in Mr. Cleveland's motto, "tell the truth," and who believe that the right way to strengthen their organization is to strengthen their county paper. A newspaper is successful according to the means furnished for its support. The means now provided while they are free of cost to the party are of vast importance to the editor of this paper, and should be freely bestowed without contest or question."

This editorial was sent with the successful application for appointment; and the Columbus, Decatur and Bloomington postoffices afford analogous instances.

Benjamin Bagby, a negro, was a postal clerk living at Indianapolis. James T. Hill, also a negro, wanted his place, and succeeded in getting evidence of Bagby's offensive partisanship. This he forwarded to the Postmaster General, and along with it an application for himself supported by a showing of his own zealous work in the last Presidential campaign. This was successful, and Hill has since held the place.

After fifty-five years of the spoils system during which subordinates have felt that their continued employment would be jeopardized by refusal to do party work, it was manifestly unfair to spring upon minor place holders such as clerks and laborers an *ex post facto* rule, punishing them for a course pursued under a former Administration, and usually under orders of superiors; and the unfairness becomes more patent when it is remembered that more active party workers have taken their places.

Experienced subordinates have been dismissed by wholesale, not for the benefit of the public service, but it is claimed to punish them for having in former years been challengers, or committeemen, or delegates, or walkers in processions; and their places have been given to challengers, or committeemen, or delegates, or walkers in processions who continue openly to be such. Furthermore, under the system of secret charges hiding both charge and accuser, it is believed that a large number have been displaced for false or trivial reasons. The course pursued has not been in accordance with the well doing of the public business or with the dignity and honor of a great government professing to institute a great reform.

CONCLUSIONS.

Regarding the Pendleton act, the President said: "My conception * * * of public duty requires that this * * * should be *in good faith* and *without evasion* enforced, and * * * I have in effect *promised* the people that this should be done." Yet, in the Indianapolis postoffice, the only office in Indiana within the Pendleton act, that law has been completely and faithlessly evaded and nullified.

With regard to removals, the President said that "They should not be made during the terms for which they (the incumbents) are appointed solely on partisan grounds for the purpose of putting in their places those who are in political accord with the appointing power." Yet the displacement of former employes by those in political accord with the appointing power has, in this State, using the words of Mr. Hendricks, in 1876, been a "remorseless proscription for political opinions."

Speaking of former partisan officials, the President said: "Such officials, as well as their successors, should be taught that efficiency, fitness and devotion to public duty are the *conditions of their continuance in public place*." Yet their successors have been platoons and companies of "unscrupulous manipulators of local party management."

The President said of many former incumbents that "they had *forfeited all just claims to retention* * * * because instead of being decent public servants they have proved themselves offensive partisans and unscrupulous manipulators of local party management." Yet of the hundreds of their successors who in Indiana have impudently and brazenly manipulated the local party machine, not one has forfeited his place.

The President said: "Selections for office not embraced within the civil service rules will be based *upon sufficient inquiry as to fitness*." Yet the places in Indiana have been given out as the booty of congressmen in disregard of fitness.

The President said October 30, 1884: "There should be no mistake about this contest. It is an attempt to break down the barriers of the people of the United States and those that rule them. *The people are bound down by a class of office holders.* * * * * " Yet this year, in six congressional districts of this State, the Federal office holders have, without hindrance or rebuke, thwarted the will of the people.

It is not a pleasant task for those civil service reformers who had a steadfast faith that every promise would be kept, to examine the work done and report the truth; but their sincerity is on trial. Besides, to stand silent now would impose silence when some other party succeeds to the national Administration. The truth must be stated plainly. In Indiana, Civil Service Reform has been disgraced and made contemptible.

LUCIUS B. SWIFT.

Indianapolis, September 28, 1886.

CONTENTS.

	PAGE.
Postoffices—First Class—Indianapolis.....	5
Second Class.....	29
Third Class.....	30
Fourth Class.....	31
Other Federal Offices.....	32, 33
Railway Mail Service.....	33
Removals.....	5-20, 29-32, 44, 50, 51
Appointments.....	5-9, 16, 21-26, 29-32, 51
Party Work—Indianapolis Postoffice.....	6, 7, 21-26
Howard's District.....	35
Lamb's District.....	35
Lowry's District.....	36
Matson's District.....	37
Holman's District.....	38
Bynum's District.....	38
Other Districts.....	30, 46
Party Work since July 14, 1886.....	49, 50
Petitions to the Administration.....	16, 38, 41, 47, 48
Tables and Summaries.....	8, 26, 27, 30, 31, 32, 49, 50

Indiana Civil Service Reform Association.

DOCUMENT No. 3.

ANNUAL ADDRESS OF THE PRESIDENT, WM. DUDLEY FOULKE, AT THE MEETING
HELD AT INDIANAPOLIS, OCTOBER 8TH, 1886.

The year which has passed over our heads since this Association was born shows a great awakening of interest in Civil Service Reform, both for it and against it. Its enemies have become its enemies in earnest, and its friends have been filled with a far greater measure of enthusiasm and devotion than at any previous time.

Indiana has been a long way behind some of her sister states in reform sentiment. The subject was scarcely spoken of here for years after it had gained a permanent foothold in the national government and in the jurisprudence of Massachusetts and New York. It is true that a declaration in favor of civil service reform was generally found in the platforms of both political parties, and now it is found in only one. But these declarations were often inserted in a perfunctory way, not intended to mean much, and were sometimes accompanied by adjective attachments—*real* Civil Service Reform, *honest* Civil Service Reform—meaning something different from the original article; and intended, like Delphic hexameters, to adapt themselves to the wishes of the listener and read either way. But now the absence of a declaration, as well as its presence, has a distinct and definite meaning: the people are beginning to realize that the insertion of any plank in favor of civil service reform is something to be avoided by the office seeker and spoilsman, and something to be insisted upon by disinterested and patriotic men.

When a new movement is founded, as we believe ours is, upon an immutable basis of truth and sound reason, the first condition of its ultimate success is the arousing of public interest. Agitation and investigation, if they spread far enough and go deep enough, are sure to bring about its accomplishment. To excite antagonism, however violent, is no sign of failure; with a just cause it is an almost certain augury of success.

The principles which underlie our reform are not hard to understand; and the demonstration of their truth can be made with almost mathematical precision.

We start with the proposition that inasmuch as the whole people pay taxes for the support of the Government, and all are equally interested in its well-being, that it ought to be administered for the benefit of the whole people, and not for

the benefit of the members of one political party alone. Will anybody deny that? Will anybody say that, as a matter of common justice, it is right to tax Democrats for services performed for the Republican party; or, to tax Republicans for services rendered to the Democratic party? Will anybody say that the whole body of the people have not a right to the most efficient service that can be obtained? Will anybody deny that that man ought to have the office who is best fitted to perform its duties?

Still another principle that Civil Service Reformers insist upon is this: that in appointments to office, as in the management of all public affairs, it is far better to rely upon a system of fixed laws and rules wherever they can be made applicable, than upon the mere discretion of those in authority. Do we believe that government by law is not better than an arbitrary despotism? Who doubts it? But why is it so? Laws often work injustice. It is hard to adapt them to each circumstance that arises. Yet, does any one outside the Russian Empire propose to go back to autocracy, instead? Has not the experience of the world shown us that men are so selfish that it is not safe to trust the interests of the individual or public to unrestrained discretion? In most matters our century has outgrown the old-fashioned ideas of personal government, and has established certain rules to regulate the affairs of mankind and the conduct of the government itself. We have applied measurably to society the plan which we have discovered in the universe, where the relations of one object to another are controlled by the operation of immutable laws; but there are a few functions of government where the personal plan still prevails. Men are still appointed to subordinate offices by the discretionary authority of the appointing power. Men are selected as keepers in our prisons and as attendants in our hospitals, not because they have shown their fitness for these places, but because certain trustees or other officials saw fit to put them there.

Now, if these boards of trustees were always wise and always beneficent, this plan would be an excellent one, just in the same sense that an absolute monarchy would be an excellent form of government if you were always sure of finding a just, wise and perfect sovereign. But the blood-marks of tyranny which have defaced so many pages of the world's history have shown that rulers are so unwise and selfish, so corrupted by the very power entrusted to them, that, in the long run, it is better to be governed by laws, to which all shall be subject, than by the mere will of any man. Our experience with boards of trustees, and even with Presidents and Postmasters-general, is the same; and we say, that in the main, it is better to establish certain fixed rules to control appointments than to leave this power any longer to their purely arbitrary will. Does not every analogy drawn from the functions of civil government and the history of civil liberty support us?

Men say of this reform that it is an aristocratic and monarchical institution. No, my friends, it is not that. It is the old system which is the relic of monarchy, still surviving, amidst institutions otherwise free. It is the system of political spoils which is the alien substance, the blighting excrescence that grows from the branches of our tree of liberty.

Well, if rules are safer than the selfish caprices of men, the rest of the problem is easy. Those rules should be adopted which will best ascertain who is the fittest man for the place among those who are willing to take it. Now, there are two ways of finding out a man's fitness; one is by examining him in reference to the duties which he is to perform, another is by actually trying him. Some things can be tested by examination alone and some can not; so we ought to do both—examine and try. No man should be a reading-clerk who does not know

how to read, nor a book-keeper who does not know how to write. No man ought to be a policeman who is too weak to seize a culprit, or too slow to catch him, or who does not know when he can arrest without a warrant and when he requires one. Yet I have heard reading-clerks who could not read, and seen book-keepers who could not calculate, and I have heard of policeman who were physically and mentally unable to perform their duties. A half-hour's examination would show these disqualifications. An examination then ought to be had.

But a government ought to have not only a good man but the very best man that can be found. Will anybody dispute this? Is it not simple justice that the man who knows best how to perform the duties of an office should have a chance of showing his qualifications? And how can you tell who is the best man until you give all a chance to try? If you refuse to appoint Republicans under a Democratic administration, or Democrats under a Republican administration, you may leave out not only the best man but the only competent man who has applied. The opportunity for appointment should be equally open to all. This is nothing but simple Democratic equality. There is no aristocratic ingredient in this principle; it is the simple justice which is demanded by our free institutions. Let the appointment be given to the worthiest.

But, you say, men do not do this in private life; clerks are not appointed by competitive examinations. But, in private business, men have a motive sufficiently strong to guarantee that the person appointed will be fit; it is to their interest to do this. In public life on the other hand, the appointing officer is not acting for himself; he is the trustee of the people under our party system. He owes his place, not so much to the whole community, as to his party; hence his party interest, and sometimes his personal interest, is opposed to his duty to the whole community, and his discretion should be limited by law.

Here you have in a nutshell the whole doctrine of civil service reform. The machinery by which these results are accomplished consist of Boards of Civil Service Commissioners and local examining boards, who prepare tests of the qualifications of applicants and fix beforehand the merit to be awarded to proficiency on each particular subject, upon which an examination is had. The examinations refer to the duties to be performed. Men used to talk of the folly of examining applicants for clerkships in Latin and Greek, as if that were ever done; in point of fact an examination of the papers prepared by the various commissioners show that the topics of examination are confined strictly to subjects which the applicant would be required to know in the discharge of the duties of the office for which he applies. But men may know how to perform their duties and still fail to do it; an examination is not always sufficient and a period of probation should be imposed. When this is done, and proper limitations as to character, age, and physical condition are imposed, we have, I think, as good a system as can be devised.

Men used to laugh at this reform. "Examine policemen," said they, "and attendants in hospitals; what nonsense!" But when this was done and found to work most successfully, even in a large city like New York, where the service was infinitely improved under the new system, the joke entirely lost its point. For civil service reform is justified not only by abstract reason but by experience. It has been tried in many places and under various conditions; and, wherever there has been a willingness to enforce its provisions in good faith, it has met with uniform success. Efforts have sometimes been made to discredit it by evading the provisions of the act, in just the same way as other civil laws, which determine your right and mine to life, liberty and property, are sometimes evaded by the unscrupulous. But the result I think is everywhere better than if the law

did not exist ; and, wherever civil service reform, like any other just and beneficent statute is reasonably supported by an enlightened public opinion, its results are sure to be good.

It has been tried under the most varied conditions ; in England, in India, in Sweden, in France, in Canada, in Australia, in the National Government, in Massachusetts, in New York, and in the cities of the Empire State ; and everywhere its results have, on the whole, been satisfactory.

It is for the propagation of this gospel and for the enforcement of the principle that public office is a trust which must not be diverted to personal or party ends, that the Indiana Civil Service Reform Association was organized.

The condition of affairs in this State at the time of its organization was about this : A few lectures had been delivered on behalf of the reform by President Jordan of the State University, Mr. Lucius B. Swift, and others. It had been sometimes mentioned in the party platforms, but there was very little knowledge concerning it abroad in the State. At the last session of the Legislature a bill was introduced (Senate Bill No. 1) based upon the provisions of the New York law, providing for a Civil Service Reform Commission, which should control appointments to subordinate administrative offices in all the State institutions ; and giving power to the various cities of the State to adopt civil service regulations for admission to the public service in such cities. The bill was referred to the Judiciary Committee, and a majority of the committee reported in favor of its passage. On the second reading of the bill an argument elucidating the principles of civil service reform was delivered in the Senate, and the bill passed its second reading. but was defeated upon the third, a number of senators who previously voted for it either voting against it or remaining absent.

An inquiry into the conduct of the Indianapolis post-office, under the administration of Mr. Jones, had been carried on by some gentlemen of this city who were interested in civil service reform ; but the Civil Service Commission found that there had not been a sufficient violation of the law to justify the removal of that gentleman, although a number of irregularities and improprieties were admitted. The time seemed ripe for an organized effort on behalf of civil service reform in this State. A call was issued, signed by many persons in different parts of the State, and the Association had its first meeting a year ago in this place. A constitution was adopted by which the business management of the Association was left in the hands of the executive committee of six, to be appointed by the President. As the investigation of the Federal civil service of the State was one of the objects contemplated, it was thought best that the members of this executive committee should consist, one-half of gentlemen who had supported the present administration at the last election ; and one-half of gentlemen who had opposed it ; the President himself had no vote in the committee. Messrs. Lucius B. Swift, Oliver T. Morton, Louis Howland, John W. Murphy, James B. Black, and Noble C. Butler were appointed on that committee. The committee, shortly after its appointment, issued an address to the people of Indiana and appointed a number of Vice-Presidents and local secretaries in different sections of the State.

The work of the Association has been two-fold : First. The propagation of the doctrines of civil service reform. Second. The examination and investigation into existing laws and into existing abuses in the civil service which required amendment by legislation. Lectures have been delivered in various parts of the State, at the State University at Bloomington, at the Normal School at Terre Haute, and at other places. Two other associations have been formed, one at Greencastle and one at Bloomington. Both these associations are represented at

this meeting. The executive committee have maintained a correspondence with the National League, and delegates were present on behalf of this Association at the last meeting of the League in Newport.

But the greater part of the labors of the Association during the past year has been devoted to the examination of existing abuses which call for a more rigid enforcement of the present National civil service law; and, as we think, imperatively demand the incorporation of similar provisions into the legislation of this State. The two matters to which the executive committee has mainly directed its attention, has been the investigation of the condition of the Insane Hospital as administered under the present partisan law, and an inquiry into the condition of the Federal civil service of this State, both that embraced in the provisions of the Pendleton Bill and the remaining appointments. The first was conducted by a sub-committee of three persons, whose report was submitted to the executive committee, adopted and published by authority of the Executive Committee.

Dr. Harrison, President of the Board of Trustees of the Insane Hospital, published in the Indianapolis *Sentinel* an answer to the report of the committee, but the most important allegations remained unrefuted. It was distinctly admitted that the management of the Insane Hospital was a partisan management, and if there was a Republican voter in its employ the trustees did not know it; that they wanted no one but Democrats, and that as long as their management continued it would be strictly partisan. It was not denied that places were given for political reasons; that legislative influence was courted by the appointment of relatives and friends of Democratic members of the General Assembly, that letters were written by directors of the Board to members of the Legislature asking them to send some one to the Asylum for appointment; that this traffic in place was reduced to a system; that many of the appointees were unfit for the positions for which they were selected; that for the responsible position of physician men were chosen without qualification or previous experience; that many employes were political workers; that subscriptions were circulated among them and funds raised for campaign purposes, among others to prosecute the Democratic campaign in Boone county, where Dr. Harrison resides. It was not denied that the politics of Wayne township were largely controlled by the employes of the Hospital in selecting delegates to Democratic conventions, and that active agitation was maintained in the Hospital in respect to the Bynum-Bailey controversy; that at the time of a recent Democratic congressional convention the Hospital was almost deserted; that employes have been vigorously canvassing while in the service of the Hospital; that additional places were made for political workers; that one of the trustees has been absent for a year, drawing pay all the time; that the trustees failed to adopt a code of by-laws for nearly three years; that frequent changes were made by the Board; that there was great discord among members of the Board; that the contract system was defective, contracts sometimes going to the highest bidder; that a claim of John E. Sullivan for butter was rejected because a former Board found it to be oleomargarine; that Sullivan worked for the Brown bill, to which the present Board owes its appointment, and his claim was allowed by the present Board; that Sullivan was awarded the contract for butter when others bid lower than he did; that he has repeatedly furnished butterine under a contract for creamery butter; that according to the Superintendent's report for May, 1885, he was awarded the contract, although Howard Duffy, of Columbus, had bid nearly one-half less than the bid offered; that inferior goods were furnished, which did not conform to the specifications, but were accepted by Hall, the steward, a man against whom R. H. Tarlton, one of the trustees, files a protest that as a book-keeper he did not keep the books, but others kept

them for him ; as store-keeper he did not receive and store the goods, and can not properly judge of them. It appeared that Trustee Gapen had received a discount of \$64.77, $2\frac{1}{2}$ per cent. returned for cash payment, from Mellen & Co., and this discount is still unaccounted for ; that 2,688 pounds of bread were wasted in a single month ; that the ironing for 750 patients was accomplished in two days, and it requires three and a half days to iron the clothing of 150 employes ; that the engine is run at a heavy cost and the machinery often is not used ; that reports of subsistence show meat tainted, butter bad, coffee not good, cabbage not well cooked, bread sour, etc. ; that cruelty to patients is of frequent occurrence ; that they are struck, beaten and teased, and owing to the large number of complaints of cruelty, Dr. Fletcher introduced the system of having upon each ward a man and wife ; that droves of hogs afflicted with cholera were slaughtered while they were dying of that disease, and the meat put upon the tables. Many of these facts are proved from the records of the Board and reports of the Superintendent. It is submitted that these matters sufficiently show the wretched character of partisan management and call for speedy and drastic measures of reformation.

The second examination was conducted by Mr. Lucius B. Swift, the chairman of the executive committee, in person. His report, which has just been adopted by, the executive committee, and afterwards by the Association, is a most elaborate and exhaustive review of the condition of the whole civil service of the State. It contained the results of several months' labor. We find in it a complete portraiture of the method of the enforcement of the Pendleton law in the one office in Indiana which is subject to its rules, and of the enforcement of the civil service reform principles of the President as stated by him in his letter to Mr. Curtis. Mr. Cleveland promised that there should be no relaxation upon his part of an earnest effort to enforce the law, and that the government positions which were not within the letter of the statute, and were disconnected with the policy of the Administration, should be free from removals upon merely partisan grounds. He stated that those who used their places for party purposes, and instead of being decent public servants were offensive partisans and unscrupulous manipulators of local party management, must be taught, *as well as their successors*, that efficiency, fitness and devotion to public duty were the conditions of their continuance in office. A definition of what constitutes offensive partisanship appeared in the confidential circular of Postmaster General Vilas, dated April 29, 1885. There were eight specifications : First, having been an active editor and proprietor of a Republican newspaper printing offensive articles ; second, having been a stump speaker ; third, having been a member of a political meeting ; fourth, having been an officer of a campaign club ; fifth, having been an organizer of political meetings ; sixth, having made his office headquarters for political work ; seventh, having put his clerks into the performance of political duties ; eighth, possibly other acts of equal force.

Mr. Vilas wrote to Mr. Swift in September, 1885 : " I hope I shall ever be as willing to remove an unfit person when appointed by me as if he had been found in the service as I took it." In the light of these declarations of the principles and policy of the Administration, Mr. Swift considers : first, the enforcement of the Pendleton Act, in the one office to which it applies, namely, the Indianapolis post-office ; and secondly, the character of the appointments and removals in this State, which are not governed by the Pendleton Act, but are subject to the principles announced in the letters of Mr. Cleveland and Mr. Vilas.

Aquilla Jones took charge of the postoffice April 19, 1885. He at once removed the assistant postmaster, cashier, stamp clerk, messenger, superintend-

ents of the registry department and carriers, and filled their places with Democrats. In the sack repair department every man and woman, within a few weeks, was dismissed and succeeded by a Democrat. These included four women upon whom others were dependent for support. The janitors of the building, watchman, engineer and elevator boy followed.

Mr. Jones said: "I made such removals for no other reasons than that the persons were Republicans." The men appointed by him to the unclassified service are active political workers; their names and acts of partisanship are distinctly specified in the report. In the classified service men were wantonly removed for the purpose of making room for Democrats. None but Democrats were appointed. Riggs, who had passed the examination, asks if there is any prospect of appointment, and Jones answers, "Who did you vote for at the last election?" Green asks if any Republicans would be appointed, and Jones answers "No." John W. Dodd, assistant postmaster, is appointed the head of the local examining board. To an Indianapolis audience such an appointment does not need to be characterized. A new examination is held almost immediately, although there are many eligibles remaining from the examination which had been made shortly before Mr. Jones took the office. Mr. Jones says that no Republicans passed this new examination. There seemed to be a sudden concentration of the capacity to answer questions in the brains of the adherents of one party alone.

Removals now began in good earnest. Wood was turned off, and Jones told him that he had no objection to him personally, but that he had promised his place to another. Wilmington went, and Jones said to him that he was dismissed because he wanted the place for some one else.

Mr. Jones tells Howland and Swift that he would not appoint Republicans even if they passed, no matter how high they stood; that he would not appoint them because they were Republicans.

Hoover had to go because, as Jones said, he was well fixed, had a farm and could take care of himself; he was going to make places for others; that it made no difference whether this was a violation of the civil service law; that he had made up his mind to make these changes. Mr. Jones tells Tousey that he had no complaint to make; that all he wanted was the place. "I am in rather an awkward place, pushed on by one party and held back by another."

Jones tells Lockwood: "You are all going anyway; I have kept all of you longer than I have wanted to; summer has come now and you can make a living, and I want you all to get out of here."

At another time Dodd said: "There are no charges at all; you have always done your work well; we want your place for a Democrat. The party pressure outside is causing removals; we are actually removing some men I think more of than the men that take their places; the new men are not as good as some of the men we are discharging."

To Schmedel, Jones says: "I have no complaint to make, only I have a Democrat whom I wish to put in your place."

Mr. Dodd says: "If we begin to make promises to keep carriers we shall have no places for our political friends." Dodd gives Mr. Hand the reason for his dismissal: "I don't know anything more than we want your place for a Democrat; we have got to begin somewhere so we begin with you." To McLeland he says: "It is better for the boys to resign than to have us trump up charges against them." And, "It almost breaks Mr. Jones' heart to have to trump up charges against the boys."

Sometimes, instead of dismissing carriers, resignations were forced, as in the

case of Benjamin Crane, to whom Dodd said: "We have nothing against you Ben, if you have nothing against us." So, Jacob H. Mattern, to whom Dodd said there was no complaint. To Blume he said: "We are well satisfied with your work, but you know how it is in politics; the postmaster is pushed harder by the Democrats than people generally know, and he has to redeem himself with his party. He has to make room for one of them and yours is the only place we can take at the present time." To Fitch, Mr. Jones says: "No, there are no charges; you know how it is; I would like your resignation by the 1st of July." To Williams he simply says: "You have been here long enough."

In some cases, however, charges were preferred. Sample was discharged because he owed a debt of ten dollars for a cloak for his sister; but Crane, appointed by Jones, who owed forty-seven dollars, is retained. And Jones tells Sarah Simmons, the widow to whom he owes the money, that he had no power to turn Crane off if he didn't pay it.

Sometimes charges are preferred *ex post facto*, as in the case of Wilmington, who was removed without cause, but when an investigation was demanded, a charge was trumped up that he acted as challenger at the last Presidential election. This was signed by six persons, one of whom afterwards stated that he did not know Wilmington by sight, and another of whom repudiated his signature and said he did not know what he signed. The actual challenger, Plummer, proved that Wilmington was absent, and the books at Wilmington's office show that he was there and not at the polls during election day. This is a charge against a Republican. Yet Browning, one of the new appointees, worked actively at a primary, made motions and speeches and had a fight with one Hennesy. He still remains.

There are many curious characters among the new appointees. For instance, the negro, Harrison, now under bond for forgery, whose autograph letter was shown, in which he promised to let a client's suit go by default in consideration of ten dollars, to be paid in advance. Then we have Charles Noe, who was still warm in the service when he was detected stealing registered letters, pleaded guilty and was sentenced. Another carrier who passed the examination creditably can not read the superscriptions of his letters. The affidavits of six witnesses were taken to whom he has applied to read for him the plain addresses of letters which he was to deliver. He had to be removed from the route and set to collecting mail. He is a politician of long standing. How did he pass the examination?

Another carrier is appointed who mis-delivers a letter to Mr. Ferguson, and when complaint is made answers, "I leave just such mail here as I like; if you don't like it you may go to hell." That man is still retained.

The recapitulation shows that in the unclassified service in the Federal building all were removed and succeeded by Democrats; and in the classified service, of seventy-one former incumbents thirty-six have been forced out, while forty-three Democrats have been appointed. The effect upon the service has been most injurious. Complaints of letters misdirected, engagements lost, of important mail matter misdelivered occur almost every day.

The *Labor Signal* says: "Every week we have numerous complaints from subscribers who fail to receive their paper. We know that copies of the paper plainly addressed have been found among the waste in the basement of the office." The janitor who disclosed this fact, however, is severely rebuked by Jones, and told that he must not tell outside what happens within. Sellers, of the Peddlers' Exchange, hauled waste paper from the postoffice, and in sorting it found, in August a year ago, a draft for \$1,000 in the pile, another smaller draft, and large pack-

ages of unopened letters, which he returned to the office, and was cautioned to say nothing about it. At one time there were 200 letters, at another about 100, and at a third time one letter. Mr. Jones discontinued the sale of waste paper to the firm which made such discoveries. Who gets the paper now? What does the sorting disclose?

Formerly mail from the west over the Vandalia was delivered the same day. Now it is not delivered until the next morning. The enumeration of instances of deterioration can be prolonged indefinitely.

The *News* of July 14, 1886, publishes this question: "The law says to everybody, in our Indianapolis postoffice, for example, 'So long as you honestly perform your duty you shall retain your place.' Has this law been honestly and fairly followed in our postoffice? Let us have a direct answer to this question." The *Sentinel* says, "And we answer no, it has not; it never was, and until the employes of the Government cease to identify themselves with the party in power and cease to obstruct the party of opposition, it never will be nor ever should be."

Mr. Jones says publicly of the law, "I despise it." Why then is he permitted to remain there to nullify it? But the administration of the Indianapolis postoffice, bad as it is, is better than the remaining civil service in this state. The Pendleton act still imposes some slight restraints upon the spoilsmen.

There are sixteen second-class postoffices, and in fifteen the former postmasters have been succeeded by Democrats. Among the subordinates the records show that there has been almost a total change. Hardly a Republican remains anywhere. There are seventy-six third-class offices, and in sixty-eight the postmasters have been succeeded by Democrats. There are about 1,800 fourth-class offices, and in about 1,200 the postmasters have been changed. The unchanged offices are not desirable places.

In the Custom House at Indianapolis, the District Attorney's office, the Marshal's office, the Collectors of Internal Revenue, in the Districts of Indianapolis, Kokomo and Terre Haute, there has been an absolutely clean sweep, with the exception of eight persons altogether.

In the railway mail service, although some Republicans remain, the changes have been very numerous, and the service has been thrown into considerable disorder. Large quantities of unworked mail are frequently seen. On the Vandalia line from forty to one hundred and sixty sacks of mail have been carried into St. Louis four days in the week unworked. Illinois mail for the east has reached Indianapolis with as high as twenty-three sacks unworked. In leaving Indianapolis men are not nimble enough to work the mail for the first stations, and comparatively large quantities are now carried past to be returned some hours later. Other lines running through Ohio, Indiana and Illinois, have carried into St. Louis one hundred and nineteen sacks unworked. This service was formerly possessed of a fine body of trained men, and had reached a high state of efficiency, but the men have been largely displaced by politicians who were given their positions as a reward to Congressmen. The bulk of them are inferior men. The influence of Congressmen is seen in appointment everywhere. The new appointees have taken the most active part in political work.

The Administration interpreted the term "offensive partizanship" in the case of Robert L. Taylor, pension agent at Knoxville, who was anxious to attend a convention where he expected to be nominated for Governor, and wrote asking permission to do so. He was answered that his presence at the convention would place him and the Administration in a position subject to misconstruction, and permission was withheld. The suspension of J. B. Hill, marshal, in North Caro-

lina was due, according to General Garland, to his presence at a Republican convention in the First Congressional District, and the canvass by which he was appointed to said convention as a delegate. But the appointees of the Democratic Congressmen in Indiana have taken a most active part in local politics without restraint. Page after page of Mr. Swift's report is filled with illustrations of scores of office-holders whose appointment is due to Congressmen Howard, Lamb, Lowry, Matson, Holman, Bynum and others, taking the most active and often the most unscrupulous part in proceedings for the renomination of the dispensers of the patronage by which they were appointed. It is not necessary to recite to an audience in this city the cases of August M. Kuhn, James T. Dowling, O. T. Wells, R. P. Corey and others. The character of some appointees has been so bad that the *Sentinel* in an editorial some months ago, was constrained to cry "halt" and to protest against the further appointment of criminals and jail-birds, and to ask that honest Democrats be given a chance. In some instances complaints have been made to the Postmaster General and to the President, but hitherto without effect. A long list is given of Federal appointees, who at the time of their appointment were connected with Democratic newspapers. This, however, did not stand in the way, though it has been cause of many removals of Republicans.

There was another matter which was submitted to the Association a year ago, but which it was thought best not to take up at that time. But a resolution passed at the meeting this afternoon indicates that the Association now regard it as a proper subject of its criticism. A letter addressed by President Cleveland to the President of the National League stated that it was the opinion of the President that a removal of the present incumbents disconnected with the policy of the Administration, should not be made during their terms of office solely upon partisan grounds, and for the purpose of putting in their places those who are in political accord with the appointing power. In accordance with this declaration it was required in the Postoffice Department that some charge of misconduct should be preferred against these subordinate officers before removals should be made. A comprehensive inquiry was made as to the cause of numerous suspensions, both in this State and elsewhere, and 136 replies revealed the fact that in only two instances had there been any investigation or notice served upon the incumbent as to the character of the charge made against him and that no opportunity had been afforded for defense, denial or explanation, and that in many cases the first information upon the subject received by the officer suspended was by newspaper report or upon the presentation of the order of suspension by the new appointee.

Requests were frequently made for information respecting the charges and an opportunity for investigation; but no such opportunity was given, nor were the charges disclosed. The President was personally interviewed in regard to this system of making removals and the names of the persons removed were given him. It was found that removals upon secret charges were with his personal approval; that he considered it impracticable to inform postmasters of charges against them; and although they asked for such information he stated that it could not be furnished them. The reason why charges are required under such circumstances is not obvious. It was ascertained that they were frequently made by persons wholly irresponsible, and sometimes by those who did not pretend to know the facts. It is evident to anyone that it is not possible to procure accurate information until both sides have at least a chance to be heard. Such a system would appear to be the product of the President's personal desire to conform to the language of his letter to Mr. Curtis and the clamor of office seekers for the spoils. Such a system encourages spies and informers, slander, falsehood and suspicion. Frequently the

accuser is rewarded for his secret slander by appointment to the office. Instances could be multiplied indefinitely.

Postmaster A. B. Bone, of Shelbyville, was suspended upon charges, the character of which he could not ascertain. Senator Harrison forwarded a letter from him to the Postmaster General thus endorsed: "The fact that this man is an American citizen should entitle him to know the charges against him;" but no attention was paid even to this.

The system of preferring secret charges against incumbents has born its legitimate fruit in the preferring of secret charges by one Democrat against another. The refusal of the President to disclose to the Senate the papers on file containing charges upon which removals were made, however completely it may be justified upon purely legal grounds, leaves an irresistable inference that there is much concealed in the files of the department that will not bear the light. The Senate itself is perhaps equally to blame in preserving secrecy as to proceedings on confirmation; but we must remember that it was the President who refused these disclosures, who had said in his letter of acceptance, "The voters of the land have learned that mystery and concealment in the management of their affairs cover tricks and betrayals."

Let us consider for a moment the significance of these removals upon charges which are to remain undisclosed. This is not a case of mere mistaken appointments which may be attributed to erroneous information; it is the deliberate adoption of and adherence to an utterly vicious principle. It is to say in effect that no one but the man who will consent to prefer charges against his neighbor, which he knows are neither to be seen nor answered, is to be rewarded with the coveted place. It is to hold out by a uniform system a direct premium to libel and false testimony, which is to be protected by the gloom of perpetual secrecy. The files of the Department are the great lion's mouth for the reception of charges against the guilty and innocent alike. To adopt such a course is deliberately to establish that law of most unnatural selection which leads inevitably to the survival of the most unfit. It is only the man who will descend to secret calumny who is rewarded by the spoils of office. It is a policy which poisons afresh the shafts of malice with a venom which destroys not only the reputation of the victim but his livelihood. The first that is known of the charge is from the reading of the sentence. And this is done under the direction of a President who has told us that the lessons of the past must be unlearned, and that fitness and not political service is to constitute the only just claim for office.

Civil service reform makes headway rapidly in our educational institutions. The instructors in colleges are generally on our side. The two civil service reform clubs in Indiana outside of the State Association, one at Bloomington and one at Greencastle, both university towns, are sustained largely from the faculty and students of Indiana and DePauw universities. This promises much good in another generation, but it is only the commencement of our great work of spreading the propaganda through the State. The bulk of the people, those who follow the plow, and the workmen in our factories, are not yet fairly awake to the necessity of civil service reform, nor do they see its advantages to them and their children. Now, unless we can reach that broad substratum of popular feeling upon which our political institutions rest we can have no permanent foundation for this reform. Before the lasting growth of our principles can be assured, they must be deeply rooted in the soil. The great body of the people must believe in them or they are not safe. And it is not enough merely to secure the assent of intellect. They should become a moving, animating principle;

they must be the object of love; they must form part of the farmer's patriotism; they must be dear to him in the same sense as the common school system and the jury trial; they should be held by him in the same kind of religious veneration with which he regards the principles for which his brother died a quarter of a century ago, when he lays his flowers and tears together upon that brother's grave. They must stand side by side in the imaginations of his heart with all the bright thoughts which cluster around the sacred name of his country. They must be united in his spirit with those liberties which he loves so well and which they are necessary to perpetuate. With every thought of his country's honor there should blend some recollection, even unknown to himself, of that wise and just system by which alone his country's honor can be preserved from the greed of the spoilsman and the corrupting power of the ambitious and self-seeking. When we have imbedded all these things in the great, honest heart of the country, then, and not till then, is civil service reform at all secure. We must plow deep into the soil of patriotic feeling. Professors might demonstrate and statesmen argue; but it was not until the great heart of England was awakened by the gaunt form of famine, and Bright and Cobden lit with the torch of their indignant eloquence the pictures of the thousands who were starving from a hunger created by a merciless statute that the corn laws were repealed. The great power which still moves the community is not mere naked reason, but earnest feeling. Until we touch the heart, our talk is but sounding brass and a tinkling symbol.

And we must learn to wait. Pindar, the poet of the Dorians, tells us that "After days are ever the wisest witnesses" These we invoke; to them we turn with faces full of hope; knowing that whatever may betide in this lustrum or the next, that the aftertimes of a republic which shall be preserved by this reform from that corruption which is nourished by the spoils of office, will cherish the work of those who have borne ever so small a part in the battle for the integrity of popular government and the perpetuation of free institutions upon the earth.

Indiana Civil Service Reform Association.

DOCUMENT No. 4.

A SUPPLEMENTAL REPORT RELATING TO THE CIVIL SERVICE IN THE INDIANAPOLIS POST-OFFICE.

INDIANAPOLIS, JULY 14, 1888.

To the Executive Committee of the Indiana Civil Service Reform Association :

GENTLEMEN—I ask leave to submit to you two or three of the late instances of the management of the civil service in the Indianapolis post-office.

J. A. Downey on the 7th of May last had been a letter-carrier of the Indianapolis post-office for fifteen years and had had the same route the entire time. This route included one side of that part of Meridian street in this city devoted mostly to the wholesale trade, and considering the value of the interests involved and the supreme necessity of promptness and regularity in delivering and taking up its mail, the route was of the highest importance.

Toward the last of April, 1888, Postmaster Jones called Downey into his room and told him that he wanted his resignation either willingly or otherwise, by May 10th. In answer to questions by Downey, Jones told him that he had nothing against him, but that he simply wanted his place for another man. Downey, depending entirely on his pay for support and not having expected a dismissal, asked the chairman of the Democratic county committee, and for whom he had carried mail for years, to ask Postmaster Jones to extend his time a little to give him a chance to look for another place, which, he correctly anticipated, his partial deafness would render it difficult to find. The chairman did so and a few days later Jones called Downey in and told him that he would extend his time to June 1st if Downey would then resign without any "fuss." Downey

agreed to do so. Again Jones repeated that he had nothing against him, but wanted his place for another man and would give him a recommendation at the proper time.

At this point the people for whom the work was being done and whose interest presumably was first to be consulted, stepped in, entirely without Downey's knowledge, as follows:

"INDIANAPOLIS, MAY 3, 1888.

"*Mr. Aquilla Jones, Postmaster, Indianapolis;*

"DEAR SIR: We, the undersigned, whose mail is and has been delivered by J. A. Downey, one of the letter carriers of your office, understand that his resignation has been asked for by you.

"We hereby express our highest satisfaction with the manner in which he has performed his duties and respectfully ask that he be retained in the service.

M. T. Kelly.	W. W. McCrea.	H. H. McGaffey.
J. D. Moore.	Geo. Hoffman.	Frommeyer Bros.
O. Gates.	R. H. McCrea.	J. Frommeyer.
Charles L. Bieler.	Aug. Deitrichs.	H. Frommeyer.
J. H. Syphers.	David Neuman.	H. Techentin & Co.
B. P. Brown.	Fred. C. Kreutler.	M. S. Zimmerman.
Syphers, McBride & Co.	David Kahn.	Omer Rodibaugh.
W. A. Applegate.	I. L. Segar.	W. G. Sherman.
Hollweg & Reese.	F. L. Spahr.	John Haslinger.
Charles C. Caldwell.	Wm. Daggett.	Levey Bros. & Co.
Daggett & Co.	Jno. F. Darmody.	W. J. Griffin.
W. H. Schmidt.	H. P. Makepeace.	Fred. Riebel.
Griffith Bros.	Vaula Saunders.	Daniel Stewart.
Fahnley & McCrea.	J. S. Lakin.	John W. Carey.
McCune, Schmidlap & Co.	W. Schwenrogg.	Lewis A. Langdon.
Schwabacher & Selig.	Charles Reimer.	Wm. V. Burkert.
Hays Bros.	Joseph G. Tilly.	H. L. Brown.
George C. Webster, Jr.	G. A. Schmitt.	Julius M. Mathews.
C. F. Wm. Cook.	L. Schmidlap.	W. M. Levey.
Jno. Reagan.	E. McCune.	L. H. Levey.
A. W. Reagau.	Charles McBride.	A. W. Glassbrenner.
N. J. Sumner.	C. J. W. Parker, Jr.	L. D. Wells.
W. M. Ballard.	T. A. Alford.	P. M. Hildebrand.
Conduitt & Sons.	Reynolds Raschig.	Hildebrand & Fugate.
J. D. Rook.	Henry Schnull.	C. S. Hildebrand.
Asbury York.	W. J. Marks.	John Vestal.
C. H. York.	M. Manion.	Lucius B. Swift.
George M. Duncan.	Wm. H. Bennett & Son.	B. F. Witt.
J. A. Richards.	R. R. Bennett.	Coons & Graham.
C. S. McCloskey.	Fred. A. Swan.	C. & E. W. Bradford.
Fred. Cook.	H. B. Mahoney.	T. W. Gardner.
William Weigel.	Indiana Cigar Co.	Livingston Howland.
Hugo Priller.	D. C. Hitt.	N. McCarty.

J. U. Rhodehamel.	J. K. Sharp, Sr.	Wm S. Hubbard.
Herm. Weinberger.	J. K. Sharp, Jr.	C. W. H. Brown.
Frank Bachtrog.	H. H. Condit.	John T. Gardner.
Gust. Hess.	S. N. Collins.	E. D. Gardner.
Howland, Condit & Co.	H. W. Diamond.	L. W. Comstock.
H. E. Zimmer.	L. W. Drew.	John H. Ohr.
Hawkins & Shaw.	Fairbanks & Co.	Moore & Coughlen.
Ben. F. Kohne.	McKee & Branham.	

Except possibly a few persons who may have been missed and three who refused to sign, the list embraces all the people, Democrats, Republicans and those of all other political proclivities, for whom Downey worked. The president of the Hendricks club and two other Democrats refused to sign, but not one had any fault to find with the way in which the work had been done.

This petition was taken to Jones by Mr. John C. Perry, a large wholesale grocer. Jones said he would not grant it because Downey had agreed that if he would extend his time to June 1st, he would resign and that he had promised his place to another man. The change was made at that date.

Andrew J. Wells served through the Mexican War as a private and was a soldier in the Union army during the entire War of Secession. He was made lieutenant for conduct on the battle field of Shiloh. To-day completes nineteen years and one month's service in this post-office. During that time, except as hereinafter stated, he has received but one demerit mark, which was for a tardiness of two minutes. A few days ago he was handed his dismissal, to take effect to-day, for failure to perform his duties and for insubordination. He was told that his failure to perform his duties consisted in not having taken the mail from a certain box last Sunday. The box was not and never has been upon his route. He, however, passes it every day and as a matter of accommodation to the carrier upon that route, he has, by an arrangement made in 1883, ever since taken the mail from that box on week days—never on Sundays, and he never was ordered to do it on Sundays. His insubordination consisted in simply attempting to defend himself when charged by James H. Deery, head of carriers, with the failure to perform his duties, as above stated. It was done in proper language and manner. But Deery remarked that he must have discipline, and a failure to keep quiet was evidently in his mind a breach of that requirement. Mr. Wells is a well-known and respected citizen and is held as a model public servant by the people whom he served in that capacity.

Side by side with these cases, I set another. Postmaster Jones appointed John R. Tompkins a clerk in this post-office. He had not been a soldier, but his father had served in the Confederate army. He was put to work at one of the delivery windows, in view of the public passing through the post-office ves-

tibule. The records of the Marion County Criminal Court show the following, filed November 17, 1887:

"STATE OF INDIANA *versus* JOHN R. TOMPKINS. No. 20329.

"The grand jurors for the county of Marion and State of Indiana, upon their oath, present that John R. Tompkins, on the 4th day of October, A. D. 1887, at and in the county of Marion and State aforesaid, did then and there unlawfully give to Alice M. Archer, who was then and there a person under the age of twenty-one years, a quantity of intoxicating liquor greater than a gill and less than a quart, contrary to the form of the statute in such case made and provided and against the peace and dignity of the State of Indiana."

In the same case, November 26, 1887, the following entry was made in Order Book 23, at page 469:

"Comes now the State of Indiana by James L. Mitchell, Prosecuting Attorney, comes also the defendant in person and by counsel [Aquilla Q. Jones]. The said defendant now waives arraignment to the indictment herein, and enters a plea of guilty. It is by the court, therefore, ordered and adjudged, that the said defendant, for the offense by him so committed, do make his fine to the State of Indiana in the penal sum of twenty-five dollars, that he pay the fine and costs herein and stand committed until said fine and costs are paid or replevied."

The additional undisputed facts are, that the "person under the age of twenty-one years" was a girl thirteen years and some months old. That she got acquainted with Tompkins in passing through the vestibule of the post-office on her way to and from school. That he asked her to ride, and met her away from home at night for that purpose. That the liquor was given her at a saloon across Fall Creek, outside of the city, and again at a resort some five miles further in the country. The arrested man was first brought before the Mayor. One of the sons of Postmaster Jones appeared as his attorney, and the matter was sent to the grand jury. The same attorney appeared when the prisoner plead guilty and was fined in the Criminal Court. The grand jury is known as "Sullivan's Grand Jury," and is the same that refused, in the face of the plainest evidence, to indict the tally-sheet forgers, who have since been sent to the penitentiary by the United States Court.

When arrested, Tompkins was suspended by Postmaster Jones. Afterwards, he was returned to his clerkship in the post-office and is in that position now.

The termination of the case in the Criminal Court was not published in the papers at the time as is usually done, and the public was first informed of the termination when it was observed that Tompkins had returned to work. How long he had then been reinstated is not known, as he was put at work which kept him usually from public view.

Comment can not add anything to these cases. They are simply additional

examples of the brazen shamelessness with which Postmaster Jones, in violation of his oath of office and of the law, has worked out all but twelve of the former employes, and in every case has worked in and kept in his partisans. He started in by saying that he would not appoint Republicans in the classified service, no matter how high they stood on examination, and he never has. He started in by saying publicly of the law, "I despise it," and without hindrance he has literally spewed it out of his post-office. March 30, 1888, he said in the *Indianapolis Sentinel*: "When I filled a vacancy, I always put in a Democrat, who had passed the civil service examination, in preference to a Republican—a course which was not only natural, but entirely justifiable." With the commencement of his operations the service began to deteriorate, and during all this time this city has had, and has now, an inefficient and unreliable mail service. And the working efficiency of the office was never so badly wrecked as it is to-day! Within six months, mail has lain undistributed in this office until the rats have eaten through the sacks and built nests in it.

The difference between the men dismissed and the men appointed by Postmaster Jones is radical. I distinctly make a few exceptions from both bodies. But, in the aggregate, the former were tidy; these are not. The former had a good bearing; these have not. The former took pride in their work and in the high grade of their office; these care little but for pay-day and in some way to get mail off of their hands. The former were extremely careful; these are careless to exasperation. The former were complete masters of the work of the office; these practically never are. The former were thoroughly skilled; these are unskilled, and have no desire to become skilled. The former were ruled by the postmaster; these act and feel independent of the postmaster. The former were not "offensive partisans;" these are petty politicians. This comparison could be carried farther and into matters more offensive, but it is sufficient to say that if the merit system, impartially carried out, should produce such results, the law would better be repealed.

At the present time the indications are that Postmaster Jones means to take away every place from the twelve remaining old employes and put in his partisans before the coming election.* In some cases he picks up a cause: this is the only lawful ground for dismissal. But the same rule should be applied to all alike. Now Postmaster Jones does not apply the same rule to all. This charge was shown to be true two years ago and it is true now. Few can compare the retention of Tompkins with the dismissal of Wells "for cause," without a feeling of outrage; this is the spoils system in its most degraded form. George, a Democratic carrier, grossly insulted a reputable citizen for remonstrating with him about unbearable blunders in the delivery of mail; yet the citizen could not

*One, G. W. Sulgrove, a soldier, has since been notified to leave August first.

even get a respectful hearing from Jones. But a street car driver told Jones that Sterns, a Republican, had made a slighting remark of Mr. Hendricks. Sterns denied it, yet he was dismissed instantly and was refused time to bring witnesses to sustain his denial, while George is in the service to-day. Two Republican carriers, Eddy and Armstead, fight, and are dismissed forthwith. Two Democratic carriers, Ellis and McDonald, fight, and are retained. He dismissed Sample, a Republican, for owing a debt of \$10.00 to a store keeper, which he was trying under difficulties to pay. But he refused to dismiss Crane, a Democrat, who owed a widow \$47.96, and would not pay. After he had dismissed Wilmington, a soldier of four years' service and a clerk without fault, Jones said he had done it because Wilmington had been a challenger at the polls at the presidential election of 1884. This charge was proved to be a deliberate falsehood; yet Wilmington has not been reinstated, and Jones has not even apologized for his dishonorable course. On the other hand, Postmaster Jones has always allowed his Democratic employes to indulge in all manner of political activity, of which late examples are Conklin, a clerk, going without permission, but unpunished, to the St. Louis convention, which recently renominated President Cleveland, and James H. Decry, head of carriers and chairman of a seventh ward meeting to form a Cleveland campaign club; and while the Government at one end was spending money to bring "Sim" Coy, the tally sheet forger to justice, employes of the post-office, without rebuke from Jones, were contributing it at the other to help Coy to escape. Further, Jones kept the negro, "Mugwump" Harrison, after it had come to light that he had offered to sell his services in 1884 to a Republican for \$25.00. Later he offered his services to organize Democratic clubs to Mr. Simeon Coy, then chairman of the Democratic county committee, if the latter would assist in the "incidental expenses." Then it came to light that as an attorney in the case of *Swannegan v. Swannegan* he had in writing offered to sell out his client for \$10.00, "nothing more or less." He spoke of it as a "digression from the ordinary course of practice." All this did not seem to stagger Postmaster Jones. But when Harrison was tried in the criminal court on a charge of forgery and was found innocent by the jury, Jones discharged him. Following the Tompkins case it might be reasoned that if Harrison had plead guilty, he might, after suffering his punishment, have again taken up his duties as carrier. These few examples, taken at random, show that the rule has not been the same for all. The history of this office during the past three years has been and is now fittingly crowned by the spectacle of John Dodd as the ruling spirit of the local civil service examining board.

Nearly all of these facts have been brought before the Administration—a course which it is useless to pursue further. The Administration is not uninformed. It has never been without an absolute and instantaneous remedy.

Its studied indifference to violation of law is the insolence of office, and it is alike insulting to civil service reformers and to the people of Indiana.

The cause of civil service reform is not lost in Indiana. In no other state does it progress so rapidly. Two years ago the lower branch of legislature passed, by a decided majority, the best reform bill that has yet been drawn and it only needed a change of four votes to get it through the upper house, when legislation became locked by a rupture between the houses. There is every prospect that at the coming election a General Assembly will be returned that will gladly pass this bill.

And the time will come when this post-office will have a postmaster and a local examining board, who will have the confidence of the people as an upright judge has it, and whose conscientious performance of their duties will not fill this office with a crop of favorites and ward politicians and all of one political stripe. Then every man or woman in Indiana who wants to share in public employment, will, without hesitation, enter the competitive lists and will feel that whatever his color, his religion, his politics, his occupation or his social station, and however devoid of official or partisan influence, he will be fairly and justly treated and that if by the competitive tests he is the best man, he will receive an appointment accordingly. And further, when he has thus obtained his position, he will not be deprived of it by thimble-rigging "politics," but he will be judged by the way in which he does his work—by his faithfulness and efficiency alone. That condition of doing the public business upon business principles, will, by comparison, only make more apparent the trickery of the management of the past three years.

LUCIUS B. SWIFT.

INDIANA

Civil Service Reform Association.

DOCUMENT No. 3.

Annual Address of the President, Wm. D. Foulke.

JANUARY 23, 1889.

The Indiana Civil Service Reform Association is now entering upon its fourth year. The enthusiasm of its members is as great as ever, and the fields of its activity have been much extended. Its influence has spread far beyond the boundaries of this State. Our work has lately been of a character quite different from that of the first two years. During those years, we investigated abuses, first, in the matter of Federal appointments; second, in respect to the State Benevolent Institutions, particularly the Hospital for the Insane.

The results of the investigation in regard to the Federal service were laid before the President by the National League. The results of our inquiries as to the Insane Hospital, were submitted to the last General Assembly. The evils in both cases remained uncorrected, and it then became our duty to set them before the people and endeavor to right, at the judgment-seat of public opinion, those wrongs which the tribunals of officialism and partisanship would not redress. We made up our minds to tell the world in every way we could, the evils which those in power would do nothing to correct. We invoked that love of country which

risers above mere party feeling, to rebuke the prostitution of patronage and the shame of spoilscraft, and we feel to day that our call has not been left without an answer. The administrations, both State and national, which permitted these abuses, have been distinctly rebuked, and it now remains for us to do what we can to see that the iniquities which, more than any other cause, led to the defeat of one party, are not perpetuated by its successor.

During the past year, while our Association has directed its attention to many objects, to the assistance of the Attorney-General, in the suit brought by him for the removal of the Trustees of the Insane, to the propagation of our reform by papers, and addresses delivered before various colleges, editorial associations and other societies in this State; while we have sent a number of representatives to the National League, who have taken an active part in its discussions, and have read papers in connection with subjects which have been developed by our labors, yet the chief work of the Association has been that of disseminating the facts ascertained by our previous investigations in respect to the conduct of the Federal administration in this State. We invited the Senate Investigating Committee to visit Indiana and examine for themselves the character of our Federal appointments. Two members of the Association appeared before this Committee, at its request, and made a detailed statement of the facts ascertained in our former investigations. The statements of these members were referred to, at considerable length, in the majority and minority reports of the committee. The conclusions of the Republican majority, presented to the Senate by the Honorable Eugene Hale, gave considerable prominence and weight to the disclosure of abuses made by this Association, while the report of the minority, presented by Senator Blackburn, a man who had pronounced civil service reform an "abortion," very consistently attempted to discredit the results of our work.

I think we may claim, however, that the people formed a pretty just conclusion as to the course pursued by the President in respect to this State. Opinions will differ as to the degree in which the President failed to live up to his principles. Opinions will differ as to the wisdom of civil service reform and its importance as compared with other issues before the country, but I think that none can be found to-day who will say that Mr. Cleveland has

91.10.1.16
been wholly true to the standard of reform which he set up at the commencement of his administration, or who will not admit that he has dealt a serious blow to his own reputation in leaving so wide a chasm between his promise and his performance.

For our part, we are not disposed to excuse the out-going Executive for his failure; with us, neither the temptations of office, nor the approval of his political associates; neither the desire for a second term, nor the advocacy of any other wise or beneficent measure, has been sufficient to palliate or condone the abandonment of this reform.

Upon the grave of the present Administration, so far, at least, as the civil service is concerned, history will write the epitaph of failure, and every political party which may succeed to power, will be the better for the warning there inscribed.

But our duty now is, not to the past, but to the future.

Our work in regard to the administration of Mr. Cleveland has been completed. Our task in respect to his successor has not yet begun.

The next question is: What have we a right to expect from the Republican party and the incoming administration? That party acquired power upon certain definite promises made to the people, and embodied in the National platform. We have a right to demand that these promises shall be fulfilled. This is the language: "The men who abandoned the Republican party in 1884 and continue to adhere to the Democratic party, have deserted not only the cause of honest government, of sound finance, of freedom, of purity of the ballot, but especially have they deserted the cause of reform in the civil service. *We will not fail to keep our pledges because they have broken theirs*, or because their candidate has broken his." We have, therefore, not only condemnation of the Independents, and their candidate, as not sufficiently faithful to reform; not only is there the strongest implied promise to do a great deal better than Mr. Cleveland, but the platform on this point is made not simply a declaration of policy, but a definite "*pledge*" to the people, which it would be shameful and dishonorable for an Administration acquiring power upon the strength of it not to carry out.

The platform goes on: "We therefore repeat our declaration of 1884, to-wit: The reform of the civil service auspiciously begun

under a Republican administration, should be completed by the further extension of the reform system, already established by law, to all the grades of the service to which it is applicable. The spirit and purpose of reform should be observed in all Executive appointments, and all laws at variance with the object of existing reform legislation, should be repealed, to the end that the dangers to free institutions, which lurk in the power of official patronage, may be wisely and effectively avoided.”

General Harrison tells us in his letter of acceptance, that in regard to every subject embraced in the platform, he is in *entire agreement* with the declarations of the convention. He is therefore in agreement with every part of this pledge, and has made it his own distinct promise. Those who know Gen. Harrison believe that there will be a substantial fulfillment of every promise made.

Now, what is the meaning of the platform? It is capable of pretty definite construction. If these words were contained in a statute, or a contract, and the matter should come before a court for determination, the judge would have little difficulty in ascertaining their meaning.

“The reform should be extended to all grades of the service to which it is applicable.” This is the pledge. By whom must that extension be made? Undoubtedly by that branch of the Government which is now invested with control over executive appointments.

The Constitution declares that “the executive power shall be vested in the President.” This includes the power of appointment to executive offices, except where otherwise provided by law.

It is the President then, and not Congress, to whom we must look for the redemption of this pledge for the further extension of the reform system. The promise can under no circumstances be fulfilled by a mere approval by the Executive of additional reform legislation. The affirmative act of extending the system must be done by the President, in whose hands the power now resides. Congress has already enacted legislation which amply authorizes the Executive to make the extensions promised. Section 1753 of the Revised Statutes, provides: “The President is authorized to prescribe such regulations for the admission of persons into the civil service of the United States as may best promote the effi-

ency thereof, and ascertain the fitness of each candidate; * * *
* * * and for this purpose he may employ suitable persons to conduct inquiries, and may prescribe their duties and establish regulations for the conduct of persons who may receive appointments in the civil service."

The power is therefore plenary. Should Congress be solicited to pass new laws, extending the operation of the reform system, the answer could be fitly made that the power to do this is already possessed by the Executive. The President has the right to extend the rules, and he has given his promise in accepting the nomination under this platform, that they shall be extended to all grades of the service to which they are applicable.

The next question is: To what grades of the service is the reform system applicable? This, also, is capable of pretty definite ascertainment. The Civil Service Act itself enumerates other grades of the service to which it is applicable, and to which it has not yet been extended. The sixth section of the Act makes it the duty of the Postmaster-General to classify the public service at each post-office where there are as many as fifty persons employed. "And thereafter, from time to time, on the direction of the President, it shall be the duty of the Postmaster-General to arrange in like classes the clerks and persons so employed in the postal service in connection *with any other* post-office."

Under this section there have been brought into the classified service only thirty-seven post offices. The Statute itself recognizes other offices to which the classification should be extended. There is no reason why it can not be extended to all offices in cities where there is a free delivery of letters and carriers are employed for this purpose. There is just as much reason for its application to these offices as to the larger places. The duties to be performed are substantially the same; the positions are non-political and the qualifications for holding them are the same. There is no court in the land that in construing the promise of the platform would deny that the reform system was applicable to such places. By the terms of the Act, it is the duty of the President to direct this extension. Such extension he has therefore, in his letter of acceptance, definitely agreed to make.

The same section of this Act makes it the duty of the Secretary of the Treasury to classify the employes of collectors, naval

officers, surveyors and appraisers, where the number of such employes shall be equal to fifty, and thereafter, from time to time, on the direction of the President, he shall, in like manner, classify the employes in connection with any office in any other customs district, and all other persons under his department not yet classified.

The provisions of this section have not yet been fully complied with, and the promise of the in-coming Administration is that this classification shall also be fully completed.

The promise to extend the reform system to all grades of the service to which it is applicable, certainly includes those grades to which civil service regulations have been successfully applied elsewhere. In such cases experience has shown that the system is applicable. The platform of the Republican party was made with reference to this fact. The men who drafted it and the convention which adopted it, knew that similar provisions had been successfully applied to grades of the service in Massachusetts, in New York and elsewhere, to which it had not yet been extended by the Federal Civil Service Reform Act, and in promising that it should be extended to all grades to which it is applicable, they certainly included those grades to which it has already been successfully applied. What are these grades? Let me offer an illustration.—

The experience of Massachusetts has shown very clearly that it is desirable that the labor service of the Government should be placed under civil service rules. By this means the country will avoid the unwholesome spectacle of vast numbers of men employed in the navy yards and elsewhere, just before election, in order to secure votes and political support.

The reports of the Civil Service Commissioners in Massachusetts testify to the success attending this extension of the system, and quote the language of the Mayor of Boston, who said that it had been a great relief to that city that the Civil Service Commission had thus taken care of the laboring population. He said, “With civil service reform in force, they are no longer in the hands of political tricksters.” We may thus fairly understand that the President-elect has pledged himself to see to it that rules are adopted insuring the application of civil service reform principles to the laborers employed for the Government, and that these men shall no longer be selected or retained for political reasons, or on account of political services.

By the Federal Civil Service Act laborers need not be classified, but there is nothing in the Act, or elsewhere, which prohibits such classification. The President has the power to make it. It ought to be made and the platform of the Republican party has substantially promised that it shall be made.

But these are by no means the only classes to which extensions should be made.

The present Civil Service Commissioners, without regard to party, have unanimously brought to the attention of the President other branches of the service to which the rules may be applied. Among these are included the employes of the Railway Mail Service, and many places in the Indian Bureau, in the Land Bureau and in the Labor Bureau. They recommended this extension to the Indian School Service, showing that persons of undoubted qualifications, tested in the manner adopted for testing the qualifications of public school teachers, could thus be furnished, and that by this process the service would be much more effective than under the system of appointments by recommendation, which frequently gives inexperience and sometimes gross ignorance.

In the War Department a number of graded clerks employed in the several depots at Jeffersonville, New York, Philadelphia, San Francisco, St. Louis and Washington, should be brought into the classified service as part of the force of the Quartermaster-General's office.

In the Department of Agriculture the classification can also be greatly extended. Some of these recommendations have already been adopted. In respect to them, civil service reformers believe that they have not only the most unqualified promise upon the part of the President-elect that the extensions made shall be maintained, but also that the law shall be applied to those places to which it is not yet extended, but where the unbiased judgment of those best qualified to determine, shall declare that it is applicable.

But the promise in the platform does not stop at the mere extension of the classified service. "The spirit and purpose of reform should be observed in *all* executive appointments." There is not an appointment to be made by the incoming President in which it

is not definitely promised that the spirit and purpose of this reform shall be observed.

What is that spirit and purpose? We can collect it from the terms of the Act. The commissioners to be appointed are to come from both political parties. The fitness of applicants for the classified service is to be tested by examination and probation; not as to political services and opinions, but as to the duties to be performed, and those only who have thus shown their fitness are to be appointed. No recommendations from members of Congress are to be received or considered. No office-holder need render any political service or contribution; he shall have no right to use his official authority or influence to coerce the political action of anyone.

The “spirit and purpose” of all this is, that in subordinate offices men are not to be appointed, rejected or discharged on account of their political work or opinions, but on account of their fitness to perform the duties of the office, and that they are not to use their official places for political purposes.

The President-elect, in his letter of acceptance, shows that this is his understanding of the spirit and purpose of Civil Service Reform. He says, “In appointments to every grade and department, fitness and not party service should be the essential and discriminating test, and fidelity and efficiency the only sure tenure of office. Only the interests of the public service should suggest removals from office.” General Harrison has the same understanding that we have of the spirit and purpose of reform, and has signified his agreement with the pledge of the platform, that this spirit and purpose shall be observed *in all executive appointments*.

We have his word for it, in the clearest language, that in appointments to every grade and department, not only of the classified service, but everywhere, fitness, and not party service, is to be the essential and discriminating test, and fidelity and efficiency the only sure tenure of office. We believe, therefore, that the spectacle will not be repeated of the appointment of new and untried men to positions for which they have shown no qualifications, on account of the aid given by them to the party, or its candidate, during the campaign. Under this, it will be impossible, for instance, that such a position as a consulship, a place

requiring business ability, and a knowledge of the language and the people of the country where the duties are to be performed, shall be filled by a man without business qualifications, and ignorant of both language and people, because such person has been an effective campaign speaker, or may have been useful in the political organization of the party in power. Fitness is to be the essential and discriminating test.

But more than this, the President-elect has told us that only the interest of the public service should suggest removals from office. This means a great deal. It means that the local clamor of political aspirants, and even the local political sentiment of the community shall not be able to accomplish the removal of that Democratic official who has faithfully performed his duty.

But the Republican platform goes further. Not only is this spirit and purpose to be observed, in all executive appointments, but all laws at variance with the object of existing reform legislation are to be repealed. This, of course, affects the legislative branch of the government. The object of the existing reform legislation is to make the tenure of office dependent upon fitness and faithful performance of official duties. The law which provides that tenure shall depend upon any other fact is at variance with the object of such legislation. The Tenure of Office Act makes a great number of offices subject to change at the end of every four years, irrespective of the fitness of the incumbent. This Act gives a pretext for the removal of meritorious officers, upon the ground that their term has expired. It promotes the appointment of those who are inexperienced, and frequently incompetent, and the promise in the platform, if it refers to anything, refers to this law. Since both branches of Congress are to be controlled by the same party as the executive branch of the Government, civil service reformers have a right to demand of them the fulfillment of the promise made in the platform, that this Act shall be repealed.

But the platform goes further and states the reason of these reforms. These promises are made "to the end that the dangers to free institutions which lurk in the powers of official patronage may be wisely and effectively avoided." What are these dangers? Most prominent among them is the danger that corrupt motives

may control the political action of our citizens in nominations, in elections, and in the conduct of the office-holders. We have just had here in our country, and in our State, an illustration of these dangers. The last Presidential election has been permeated by influences on both sides which are quite different from the unbiased and free choice of the people.

Each party makes the claim against the other that the past election was influenced by force, fraud and venality.

A few days before election great numbers of so-called special deputy marshals were appointed, wholly from one political party, for the alleged purpose of protecting the election, and for the evident real purpose of protecting the interests of that party only, and intimidating and coercing its opponents. Men were arrested by the score who had committed no crime. These men belonged almost exclusively to the opposing political party. In some instances they were taken away from the polls before they had an opportunity to vote, and were thus deprived of their franchise.

Another form of coercion was illustrated where those in charge of the county poor, the idiots, imbeciles, and the insane, brought them in squads to the polls, placed ballots in their hands, and required them to vote for the political party which these care-takers represented.

Another form of improper influence exists where the employer of large bodies of men insists, persuades, and demands of them that they shall vote for the party whose success he desires. There may be no actual threats, but it frequently occurs that the men who thus cast their votes, feel that their security for continuance in place depends upon compliance. There are many working men in Indiana, and elsewhere, whose political conduct has been controlled by these considerations, and so long as this is true, elections are not free.

Nor was force the only means resorted to. Fraud was present at many precincts. Ballots were folded together, one inside the other, in such manner that they would separate when inside the box. The instances were numerous where the number of ballots cast was in excess of the number of persons voting.

The popular voice has also been stifled by another political scheme known as the Indiana gerrymander of 1885.

In this we have the remarkable spectacle of a law passed by the legislature, apportioning the vote of the State, where the evident design of such apportionment was to give one political party a representation nearly double that to which it was fairly entitled.

Both in Indiana and elsewhere, charges of wholesale venality are made, and apparently supported by pretty clear evidence. In some places, droves of men are said to have been confined during the night preceding election day for the purpose of marching them to the polls in the morning and voting them like so many cattle. Letters alleged to have been written by political managers on both sides, have been paraded before the people until there is a growing belief in the fact that corruption exists in both parties among a large proportion of the voters.

The size of this so-called floating vote is doubtless much exaggerated. Still it is quite large, and with the narrow margin by which either party is able to carry the State, suspicions are always cast by those defeated upon the honesty and good faith of the result.

The evils flowing from this corruption are not immediately seen; the people finally acquiesce in the result; government goes on much as before, and it becomes generally understood that each party buys votes, and that the most skillful carries away the reward of victory. But this public tolerance of corruption is itself the fatal disease. A republican government can stand a great deal of evil, and survive and prosper in spite of it; but it can not endure a general weakening of the public conscience.

What, then, is the remedy? Men may talk about penal legislation from now until doomsday. This alone will never accomplish the purification of our politics. We must do something to lessen the motive for corruption, and the means by which it is to be accomplished. The proposed ballot-reform law will accomplish a good deal. Party managers will be slow to purchase the floating vote when they can not see it delivered. There are not many purchasable voters who can be trusted alone. Still votes will be bought, even after the passage of this law. Another remedy quite as efficacious, is to remove as far as possible the motive for this corruption. In the campaign which has just closed, as well as in several which have preceded it, it can not be denied that one of

the most important reasons why large sums of money were expended upon both sides, was because a great many offices, valuable pecuniarily, and because they are considered positions of honor, were depending upon the results of the election. Doubtless some of the money spent was contributed by those who believed that they had a financial interest on one side or the other in the tariff issue involved in the campaign; but the motive of the greater part of the corrupt energy expended just before the election, was the hope on the one side of acquiring office, and on the other of retaining it. Over 100,000 places were held up before the people as the great prize of the contest. From these sources came the countless rills which went to fill the stream of corruption. Mr. Cleveland himself felt that he had to throw over the reform to which his earlier administration was pledged, in order to secure his re-nomination; that his political duty required of him an extensive contribution to the campaign funds to secure his re-election. Since the election, many of those who took part in it on behalf of the winning side, have been clamoring for recognition for political services. The demands for office are founded not so much on ability to perform its duties, as upon claims of political gratitude—for work done and money spent to secure the election of the in-coming Administration. The suitors who beset this unwilling Penelope, press their claims upon the very ground which in most cases ought to lead to rejection of them, and it is a question how far such claims can be ignored by any President, no matter how pure his intentions, so long as it remains a discretionary matter with the Executive. Claims of personal and political gratitude will often be found paramount to those of State duty. The Administration may realize as clearly as anyone that the tendency of this is wrong, but the current will be too strong to resist, unless the Executive shall himself consent to abandon his own discretion in the matter of subordinate non-political appointments, and leave them to be determined upon the ground of the fitness of the applicant under general rules.

Nothing but the substitution of law for arbitrary discretion can remove the abuses which have crept into our public service under the spoils system. Let a President act ever so heroically in refusing the demand of the party workers, the effect of his refusal

will be temporary. The next Administration will be likely to destroy all the good that has been done. It is only by general acquiescence in a system which removes subordinate and non-political offices from liability to change at each election that we can hope for reform which will be permanent. This can be done only where appointments are controlled by rules. It is within the power of the President to extend the present civil service rules to all branches of the service. We can not doubt that he must wish to relieve himself as much as possible from partisan clamor for office by incompetent men. There is no better way to do this than by extending the rules as far as possible, and the sooner this is done, the more speedy will be the relief.

When men find that they are not rewarded for services to the party by offices which are paid for by the whole people, but that their claims depend wholly upon their ability to fill the office sought, we shall cease to have political work conducted for mercenary and personal ends. Politicians will work more for principle and less for place, and the dangers to our system of government from the corrupt use of money and other proper influences at elections will be greatly lessened.

Not only have the promises of the in-coming Administration been set forth in the platform of the party, but in many respects they have been still more explicitly declared in the letter of acceptance of the President-elect. He says: "The law regulating appointments to the classified civil service, received my support in the Senate in the belief that it opened the way to a much-needed reform." General Harrison then regards the civil service act as the mere opening of the way to a reform, to which it has not yet been applied. He says: "I still think so, and therefore cordially approve the clear and forcible expression of the convention upon this subject. The law should have the aid of a friendly interpretation, and be faithfully and vigorously enforced." This can not be done if men who are not in favor of the law—men who, like Aquilla Jones, say of it that they despise it—are appointed to enforce it. The appointment of spoilsmen to offices which give them the power of selecting employes in the classified service, would be a distinct violation of the principles set forth in this letter. If such men are selected for the service

of the Government, the President-elect has substantially assured us that will be excluded from places which involve the selection of employes under this Act.

The President-elect goes on: "All appointments under it should be absolutely free from partisan considerations and influence." But this can never be so if those vested with the power to make such appointments are so deeply affected by party considerations and influence that their judgment would be affected by it in making appointments under the law.

The President-elect says further: "Some extensions of the classified list are practicable and desirable." What these extensions shall be is set forth in the platform of the convention, which promises that the spirit and purpose of the Act shall be extended to all offices to which it is applicable. "Further legislation," says General Harrison, "extending the reform to other branches of the service to which it is applicable, would receive my approval." This promise is not of any great importance since legislation already exists empowering the President to extend civil service rules to any branch of the service to which it can be properly applied.

The President-elect says: "In appointments to every grade and department, fitness, and not party service, should be the essential and discriminating test, and fidelity and efficiency the only sure tenure of office. Only the interests of the public service should suggest removals from office. I know the practical difficulties attending the attempt to apply the spirit and purpose of the civil service rules to all appointments and removals. It will, however, be my sincere purpose, if elected, to advance the reform." He then declares that in spite of his knowledge of the practical difficulties, he will advance the reform. He has nowhere indicated his disapproval of any part of the platform which has shown the means by which it is to be advanced. An extension of the classified service to every place to which it can properly apply, must therefore be accomplished before the in-coming Administration shall have completed its term of office. The spirit and purpose of that reform must be applied to every office, high and low, within the bestowal of the Executive. In spite of the difficulties, he will advance the reform, and the platform to which he has assented, has shown the means by which this is to be done.

I think I can say for the Indiana Civil Service Reform Association that it intends to apply to the new administration the same standard of duty which it applied to the old. While Grover Cleveland was President, if we discovered abuses, we laid them, in the first place, before the officers by whom they should be remedied. If no remedy was applied, we brought them to the notice of the Executive, before giving them to the world and inviting popular criticism. We shall pursue exactly the same course hereafter. There will be not the slightest change of policy or procedure.

The principles of Civil Service Reform rise above and beyond all matters of temporary political expediency.

Whatever party may hold for the time the reins of power, we propose to remain faithful to these salutary and enduring principles.

Indiana Civil Service Reform Association.

DOCUMENT No. 6.

REPORT OF THE SPECIAL COMMITTEE APPOINTED BY THE PRESIDENT OF THE
INDIANA CIVIL SERVICE REFORM ASSOCIATION TO EXAMINE THE
WORKING OF THE POLICE DEPARTMENT OF THE CITY
OF INDIANAPOLIS UNDER MAYOR TAGGART.

To the Executive Committee of the Indiana Civil Service Reform Association :

GENTLEMEN—Having been appointed by the President of your Association a special committee to investigate the working of the Police Department of the City of Indianapolis, I respectfully report as follows :

In the middle of December, 1899, twenty-one policemen and twelve firemen, in the service of the City of Indianapolis, were summarily dismissed from service. No charges were preferred against any of these men and they were not given trial, but were unceremoniously put out. Suit was brought in the Superior Court to test the question of the power of the Board of Safety to discharge the men without charge or trial. The only question before the court was the naked one, whether the Board of Safety could act except upon formal charges and trial. The morals or character of the men were not in issue, but the defense, for the purpose, apparently, of prejudicing the public against the men, and of intimidating them, filed an answer containing charges of a serious nature against the private character of the men and this was given to the public through the newspapers; but such answer was not properly filed and had no connection with the merits of the controversy, the motive apparently being to blacken in advance the reputation of the men, and this act serves as an example of the spirit manifested by the city administration from first to last in this disgraceful affair.

The court held that the men were not properly dismissed and that they could be discharged only after formal charges and trial. Afterwards, the Board of Safety preferred charges and tried a large number of the men. It appeared that as to some of them there were no charges and they were left on the force. As to

a large number of the remainder the evidence was of a flimsy character. The men were accused of winking, blinking and congregating and they were suspected of not holding in high regard some of their superior officers. There was an attempt made to show that some of the men had been guilty of immoral acts and the evidence upon this subject, in the main, was given by harlots and the criminal classes, whose testimony would be of doubtful value under any circumstances and utterly unworthy of belief where, as in this case, these witnesses were held *in terrorum* by the police department, which at all times has the power to wreak vengeance upon them.

The evidence at the trial of the policemen was, as to most of the men and in fact as to all who stood trial, entirely insufficient to have convicted them before a fair tribunal of any serious neglect of their duties and it certainly was not sufficient to justify their discharge. Many of the men dismissed were the best men on the force, far above the average in intelligence, efficiency and reliability. It is too plain for mistake that, with a few exceptions, the men were removed from personal spite, for political reasons and to make places for favorites. The offenders were not the discharged men, but the administration, that first ignored the law, and afterwards, being compelled so to do, followed the letter of the law but violated its spirit and under a legal process accomplished its avowed purpose to get rid of good and efficient officers without sufficient cause.

What has been said of the policemen is largely true of the firemen. As to some of them, no charges were preferred and they were left on the force. As to others, the evidence was vague and of no consequence. The offenses were trivial and the charges paltry. The evidence against both the policemen and firemen was, in part, of acts which occurred after they were dismissed, showing that they were not originally dismissed for the offenses charged later. In fact, in nearly all the cases, the men had never been reprimanded nor called to account for any of their misdeeds, though evidence was brought in some cases of alleged offenses running back over a period of years.

This action of the Board of Safety, while peculiarly unjust and cruel to many of these men who have given some of their best years to the public service and who have thus been deprived of their means of living at a period of their lives when it is difficult for them to get other places and who have been cut off from the benefit of the pension liberally provided by the tax payers of Indianapolis, has at the same time degraded the police and fire forces of the city and permanently injured the discipline and morale of the department. The best men will not seek these places if they are to be turned out in the manner and upon the trifling and insufficient evidence which made the trials of these men a ridiculous travesty upon judicial proceedings. It has been stated unofficially, by at least one member of the Board of Safety, that the Board would always get rid of any man it desired to. This was an open avowal of a conclusion already drawn from the official acts of the Board.

The charter of Indianapolis provides that the Board of Safety shall adopt rules for the appointment of the firemen and policemen. The Denny administration did adopt rules and men were appointed on the force only after a competitive examination conducted according to civil service rules, but since Mr. Taggart has been mayor these rules have not been followed nor have any other rules been adopted. The entire effort, so far as one can judge by what has been done, has been to make every man working for the city, in high or low places, a Taggart man—a subservient tool of the Taggart machine.

Under Mr. Taggart's administration it has frequently happened that the Police Surgeon has reported a man physically unfit to be a policeman and yet some influence has caused the surgeon's report to be altered and the man appointed. It has been repeatedly charged in newspapers, and not once denied, that Mayor Taggart himself has caused such changes to be made in order to get his favorites on the pay roll. In 1899, the legislature provided a tax should be levied upon all city property to create a pension fund to be paid disabled policemen and firemen. It is of the highest importance, therefore, that no man should go on the force who is not physically fit, and the above acts of the city administration were unlawful and fraudulent.

The charter of Indianapolis forbids men on the police and fire forces from taking an active part in politics. The city administration permitted to be levied upon policemen and firemen an assessment of twenty dollars a head for the benefit of the democratic city campaign in 1899, and the payments of this assessment, in some cases, was coerced by threats, and it is needless to say that the money was seldom paid voluntarily, but through fear. Not only so, but some of the men were assessed for the state and county campaign as well as for the city campaign. Richard Herrick was clerk of the Bertillon system for the Board of Safety; he was a man of the highest efficiency and entirely incorruptible. In the last city campaign he was asked to go among the policemen and firemen and collect a campaign assessment of twenty dollars apiece, but he declined. Soon after the election Superintendent Quigley notified him that his resignation was wanted; one reason given for Mr. Herrick's dismissal was his refusal to collect the campaign assessment. Another reason given was that Councilman Sam Perrott's brother had to have a place, and in fact, Herrick's place was given to him.

During the last city campaign, when Mr. Taggart was running the third successive time for Mayor, two patrolmen served at least three weeks each in the Democratic campaign committee rooms in citizens' clothes and at the same time drew pay as policemen, and though not present at roll call nor on their beat, were properly entered up as present and on duty as policemen.

The police force has been used as an organization to promote private ends. It has been used against certain interests and for other interests. When a movement was on foot in 1899 to have the city grant a thirty-four year franchise to the Street Railway Company, there was a strong feeling against the measure and a public meeting of those opposing the demands of the street car company was called for Tomlinson Hall. The city received the rent for the use of the hall from those in sympathy with the meeting. The police always attend public meetings to keep order. It will be remembered that at this meeting the street car company sent a delegation, which attempted to control the meeting; there was great disorder and the meeting was nearly broken up by those who opposed the objects of the meeting; but the police, contrary to their custom on such occasion, made no effort to preserve order and gave no assistance to those in charge of the meeting until there was about to be a personal encounter between some of the parties. It transpires that the policemen were instructed by their superior officers not to interfere at that meeting except to prevent personal violence; that as the policemen declare, their hands "were tied by the order of the Superintendent" and they stood by while the rights of those who called the meeting and hired the hall were overridden. In short, the Police Department was in conspiracy with the street car company to throttle free speech.

On another occasion, on a change of venue from this county, there was pending in Lebanon a civil suit by property owners for damages on account of the alleged disorderly management of Kissel's beer garden in Indianapolis. At roll call the names of a large number of policemen were read out and they were ordered to be at a certain train to go to Lebanon as witnesses for the defense and they were also, at the same time, publicly admonished that the Kissel crowd "have been good friends to us and now we must stand by them." These men were going as witnesses to testify in court.

In 1898 an organization was made by the leading manufacturers and sellers of beer in Indiana for the purpose of raising the price of beer. Those who stood out and declined to go into the combination were most of them forced in or driven out of business. But still there was independent beer sold in Indianapolis. The price of beer was raised one dollar per barrel when the war tax went on, but until this combination was formed beer sold at from five to six dollars per barrel. The beer trust raised the price to seven dollars and twenty cents. The independent beer was sold at the old price. A brewery at Dayton, Ohio, among others, continued to sell independent beer at Indianapolis. In order to break down this competition the beer trust resorted to the usual method of the trust and shipped beer from Indianapolis and sold it at Dayton for four dollars per barrel, though the same beer was not sold in Indianapolis for less than seven dollars and twenty cents. And yet, in spite of this strong combination, independent beer was largely sold in Indianapolis. One man representing Dayton beer supplied fifty saloons. It became necessary, therefore, for the beer force to call out reinforcements or the beer trust was doomed. This reinforcement was furnished by the police force of Indianapolis. This is a strong statement, but it is supported by so many facts that there can be no doubt that it is true.

In January, 1899, the following written order was posted at police headquarters:

DEPARTMENT OF PUBLIC SAFETY.

INDIANAPOLIS, IND., January 23, 1899.

J. F. Quigley, Superintendent of Police:

DEAR SIR—At a meeting of the Board of Public Safety held this day the following rule was formulated and you are directed to see that it is strictly obeyed:

Patrolmen must not enter any saloon in the city in uniform, whether on duty or not, except in case they are ordered to do so by their superior officers and when there is fighting or unlawful conduct being permitted in the saloon that requires their presence in their line of duty.

Yours very truly,

EDWARD H. DAVIS,

Secretary.

It had theretofore been the custom of policemen to go into saloons frequently and to keep a sharp lookout on such places. It is in some of the saloons that the thieves and criminals spend much of their time. It is where burglars spend the day and policy playing and gambling is likely to be carried on. In short, in any city a policeman would be much hampered in the discharge of his duty if he could not go into the saloons. A soldier might as well be told not to go in search of the enemy as to tell a police officer that he should not enter a saloon. The object of this order, under whatever pretext it was made, was to give the beer trust an advantage, as the sequel will show. This order was followed by another order that if a saloon-keeper was caught violating the law, he should not be arrested on sight, but that a report of the matter should be made to headquarters. These

orders, bad as they were, applied to all saloons, but it was a proper basis for what followed. The saloons were now freed from the old time espionage and it was only necessary to single out certain saloons as exceptions. Such selections were made. The police were given type-written lists of saloons which were to be closely watched. These saloons were to be entered and re-entered and if the law was by them violated in the least tittle, the offenders were to be immediately arrested, and "run in." There was to be no reporting of the case without arrest, as in other cases. I give here an abstract from the affidavit of one of the patrolmen:

Since James F. Quigley became Superintendent of the Police force, a little over two years ago, and shortly after the election of 1897, the police force has been systematically used to favor certain saloons and beer interests. While the laws against selling liquor on Sundays and holidays, and to minors and to drunken men, and after the hours of eleven o'clock at night, have not been enforced, as a general rule, yet certain saloons and saloon-keepers were designated by Superintendent Quigley as being places and persons who should be vigilantly watched and if any violation of the law could be detected in their places or by them, they were to be promptly arrested and brought in. In March, 1899, a written list was made out of saloons that should be thus watched.

When I was patrolling District No. 7, bounded on the west by Noble street, on the north by New York, on the east by the corporation limits and on the south by the Big Four and Pan Handle tracks, there were in that district, at that time, thirty-one saloons; of this number twenty-six were known as handling independent or outside beer. The five so-called independent saloons were the following: John Heffner, Rural and Washington streets; Charlie Stites, Beville and Washington streets; James Madden, Arsenal avenue and Washington streets; Charlie Scheffendecker, New York and Davidson streets; Frederick Hinnenkamp, 237 North Noble street.

These five saloons were the most orderly and quiet and law-abiding saloons in my district and as good and well conducted as any in the city. In March, 1899, I was given by my captain, as coming from Superintendent Quigley, a type-written slip, containing said places, and the only ones in my district, and instructed to catch the above men, if possible, and if necessary, to back-track on them; that is to say, go through their places and go away for a short time, leading them to believe that I would not be there again until my next round, but very shortly to come back and go through the place again, and to use every endeavor to detect them in the violation of some law or ordinance.

James Madden, one of these men, told me afterwards that he had changed beer and that they were not bothering him anymore. Of the twenty-six other saloons on my beat there were seven that were constantly violating the law, and I made reports of at least three places which I now recall, where the laws were being violated, but no attention was paid to my reports and no prosecutions followed. Shortly before the last city election I was instructed to catch Philip Hauffbaner, Hill avenue and Arsenal avenue, if possible, in violation of some law, and if we found him open ten minutes after eleven o'clock, to run him in. A night or two after I received that order I called the attention of Sergt. Lowe to the fact that, and showed him on the ground, that the saloon of Jimmie Malloy, across the street from Hauffbaner's, was then and there open and running at twenty minutes past one o'clock in the morning; and when he and I looked in at the window at the time there were three men standing at the bar drinking. I told the Sergeant that we ought to go in and get him. But he said no, it would be better to make a report of it. I did make the report and never heard anything further from it.

Since Mr. Quigley has been superintendent the laws governing saloon-keepers against gambling, dice-throwing, policy playing and other like offenses have been enforced only spasmodically and irregularly and against certain persons and places, but there has been no pretense of enforcing it regularly and systematically and impartially.

I have seen beer wagons unload beer on Sunday at Maurice Donnelly's saloon, within thirty feet of Superintendent Quigley's office, and since said saloon has been opened it has been wide open every Sunday.

And from the affidavit of another policeman:

A police officer could not go into saloons in search of criminals or to see whether the laws against gambling or against the sale of liquor to minors or other laws were violated. All that a thief had to do was to take refuge in a saloon and he was safe from police interference. Gambling could be carried on while policemen passed by, not daring to enter. If the police-

men did their duty in an effort to prevent drunkenness in saloons, in preventing the sale of liquor to minors, in preventing gambling in saloons or otherwise interfering with the business of saloon-keepers, they were reported by the saloon-keepers to headquarters and the policeman would be changed to another beat. Saloon-keepers openly and boldly defied the police and told them they did not dare to enforce the law, and if they did meddle with their affairs by enforcing the law, they would have them changed to other beats. Such threats were not only made, but they were carried out, and the same man who, in defiance of such threats attempted to do his duty, would be removed to other beats. Certain favored saloon-keepers carried on their business in utter defiance of the policemen and in perfect security from prosecution. Gambling in all its forms, and especially policy playing, has been growing and increasing in the city during the last four years. No serious effort is made to check it, though the places and the operators are, many of them, well known to the officers and men of the force. Against certain individuals and against certain places the laws at certain times have been enforced with great rigor and harshness, while as against other individuals and other places and at other times no attention has been paid to the law and no effort made to enforce it.

And from the affidavit of another patrolman :

About three weeks last August, I had District No. 2. There were at least fourteen saloons in that district at that time and we were under orders at that time not to enter any saloon or drinking place in uniform, or while on duty, so that we did not enter saloons to see whether the law was violated and had no way of knowing what was going on in the saloons; but I received instructions from my captain as follows: "I want you to go down and get Lyons, saloon-keeper at 410 West Washington street; arrest him for selling on Sunday (it was Sunday morning when the instruction was given) and for violating section three of the Nicholson Law; also get Archie Greathouse on Indiana avenue; be sure to get them; I will hold you responsible." I went at once to Lyon's place and found three men drinking at the bar; I arrested him and sent him in. I then went to Greathouse's place, but he apparently had got word that I was coming and I did not find him violating the law. I appeared in police court the next morning against Lyons; he was there with an attorney, but his case was never called for trial so far as I know; I was never called as a witness, at any rate. The following or second day after that, I was called into the office after the roll call by my captain and told to "lay off" of Lyons, that he was all right now.

And from the affidavit of another patrolman :

Patriek Ward was a saloon-keeper on Senate avenue. I am informed that he endeavored to negotiate with Maurice Donnelly, of the Terre Haute Brewing Company, for beer, but they could not agree upon a price; that said Ward then purchased beer in Chicago and supplied his own and other saloons and also set up bottling works. I was then given a slip at roll call with said Ward's name on it and I was then called into the office and was told by the officers in charge to get Ward in any possible way. This was in the fall of 1899 and preceding the election. Preceding the same election I received similar slips and similar instruction as to the following saloon-keepers: B. Kauffman & Sons, 382 West Washington street; Archibald Greathouse, 214 Indiana avenue; Charles A. Lyon, 410 West Washington street; Myer Levy, 426 West Washington street; James Moxley, 302 West Washington street; James Nichols, Indiana avenue. These orders could not have been based upon the ground of disorderly saloons, because, as a general rule, the spotted saloons are run just as quietly as the saloons not spotted and in fact, more quietly. As to James Moxley, after a few days I was told to give him no further trouble and to keep out of his place.

And from the affidavit of another patrolman :

During last summer I was called upon by my captain and given a list of some eight or ten saloon-keepers that were to be carefully watched, and if caught in the violation of any law, whatever they were, to be forthwith arrested and brought in. Among the saloon-keepers so singled out was Fred. Wachstetter, Indiana avenue, Pat Ward, North Senate avenue, Gustave Pink, Indiana avenue and West street, Jake Roller, Senate avenue and Washington street. I caught Wachstetter and he was arrested. Wachstetter's place was on the corner of two streets, and on each of the other three corners there was at the same time a saloon. Wachstetter's place was no more disorderly and law-breaking than the other three places, but the other three places were not molested or inspected, and while the laws governing saloon-keepers and gambling, were, as a rule, not enforced, certain places were singled out and vigilantly and continuously watched, so that the proprietors could be arrested.

The places thus singled out were, as is shown, among the quietest and best places of the kind in the city and their offense was not in violating the law, because other saloons were violating the law at the same time openly and publicly. At the very time these men were being hunted and "laid for" there was a saloon run wide open within the shadow of the Police Headquarters. This place was constantly open after hours and open on Sunday and beer wagons openly drew up and unloaded beer there on Sunday and the police officers in going out with these slips passed by the door of this saloon and the Superintendent of Police passed the same every time he went to his office; and yet it was not molested. The reason was, it is owned and operated by a member of the beer trust.

A group of saloon and barrel house keepers bought outside beer; they were arrested and harrassed for offenses that were overlooked in the saloons handling trust beer. They were threatened with the enforcement of the pure food law on account of the bad whiskey it was claimed they handled.

What was the result? Simply that the independent saloon keepers surrendered. Did they obey the law better? Not at all. They bought peace by shutting off the independent beer and by buying the trust beer. Their offenses were forgiven, and whereas, when they bought beer in the open market the police "laid on" them; when they bought only trust beer the police "laid off" them.

The man who had fifty customers for Dayton beer, among whom were the places named above, Charles Stites, James Madden, Charlie Scheffendecker and Frederick Hinnenkamp, lost all his customers, and, whereas, before the city administration took up arms in the beer war he had a flourishing business; after that his market was ruined, he closed his business and his place is now idle.

The barrel house keepers became frightened and had to let go of the Chicago beer and buy from the trust, so that the traffic in independent beer was almost entirely stopped by the aid of the police department. The beer trust not only shut off competition by the assistance of the police department, but it, or some of its prominent members, seem to control the collection of license fees due the city. One saloon on West Washington street was open about five months and never took out any license, but paid seven dollars per week to the Terre Haute Brewing Company for license. The city has a license inspector whose business it is to see that no saloon is run without license, but in this case, at least, the brewery collected one hundred and forty-five dollars solely, as shown by its receipts, for license, but no license was issued and no money was paid to the city.

These matters have nothing to do with the ordinary beer question nor with any controversy about how far the State should regulate the liquor traffic. They have to do with the impartial administration of the law, which is a fundamental principle of government, and the astounding lengths to which this city administration has used the police department to aid a trust, organized to crush out competition, must shock the sense of any one who cares about free government. It is the same thing as has prevailed so largely in New York City where blackmail was collected from law breakers and when license to do business was granted by and the prices therefor was paid to the Tammany Society and not to the city.

The Police Department which pursued with relentless fury the saloons using independent beer, has given greater latitude to gambling and policy playing; the old system of granting indulgences has been revived by this department; those who stand in with the administration are permitted to violate the law. This is especially true of a form of gambling known as policy playing, which is carried on largely among poor people. Some instances have come to light where the

Police Superintendent has been notified of the persons and places where and by whom the games are carried on in which husbands and sons were dissipating the money necessary for the support of their families and where wives and children in distress have appealed to the police department. The only result of such notice or appeals appears to have been a mild admonition by the Superintendent to the operators "to be more careful." The order quoted above requiring patrolmen to keep out of saloons has given a free hand to policy players, crap shooters and gamblers generally and it is a notorious fact that these games have flourished under this administration with the apparent approval of the police department. I quote from the affidavit of Charles H. Thurston, made January 5, 1900:

In the last of January or the first of February, 1899, I played three numbers in a policy game conducted by Ollie Lanham in the old Sentinel Building, corner of Meridian and Circle streets, in Indianapolis. These numbers were officially reported to me as having won. Ed. Foill was the carrier in connection with the game. On receiving this report I went up to the headquarters of the game to get the twenty dollars which was due upon the numbers. I saw Ollie Lanham and he refused to pay, claiming those numbers had not been played. I told Lanham I would report the matter to Superintendent Quigley and he answered, "See Quigley and be damned; we don't care anything about Quigley." I then reported the matter to Quigley and he asked which place it was and I told him. He then said: "I'll see Ollie about it and you come back in a few days." In a few days I went back to Quigley and he said, "I haven't had time to see Ollie yet, but you go over there and tell him I said he had better pay you." I gave Quigley's message to Ollie Lanham and he told me to go to hell, that he wasn't going to pay it.

* On February 24, 1900, one of the city papers contained the following item:

It is being remarked by citizens that the policy sharks are not the only persons in Indianapolis who seem to have immunity from arrest. The peddlers of lottery tickets make their rounds regularly and have established agencies. It is well understood that the lotteries take several thousand dollars out of Indianapolis every month. This was the way Royal C. Hammer, one of the lottery agents, flaunts his business before the people of the city through the city directory, just issued, in black type: "Hammer, Royal C., General State Agent Gulf Coast Artificial Ice Co., Mexican International Baled Hay Co., Santo Domingo and Nicaragua Maritime, International and Interocean Oriental and Occidental Canal Steamship and Dock Co."

CRAPS AND POKER.

Now and then the police get after John Woodard for selling a few lottery tickets, and in looking for him they always fail to see others. Within the last week, from all accounts, several new crap games have been opened in the city, and the poker games and other forms of gambling are running uninterrupted.

It is the testimony of men who get around that the gamblers seem to understand that they are to have things their own way from this on.

For years, with a brief interval, a horse race betting room was conducted at the corner of two alleys just off Washington street and North Illinois street. It was a notorious gambling pest of the worst kind, but the police ignored the existence of the room and it was claimed there was no law for shutting it up. William Tron managed the place; he fell out with the Taggart administration and opposed the re-election of Mayor Taggart in 1899. Immediately after the election Tron was notified that he must shut up his place. He did shut it up at once and it has since been closed. Why was this place closed after it had been so long run in the same identical room and manner? The answer readily suggested is that it was closed to punish William Tron for opposing the election of Taggart.

The Charter of Indianapolis has been in operation for nine years. It was intended to and does place in the hands of the Mayor of the city complete control of the administration of all the laws and the control of all executive departments of the city government. Good or bad government in the city, therefore,

is dependent upon the mayor. In this view the mayor has used his large powers in a despotic manner to favor his friends and allies. He has scourged some law-breakers and others equally guilty he has earessed. He has violated the charter in dismissing thirty-three members of the police force and fire department at one time without charges or trial. He has since conducted a mock trial of the same men and re-discharged a large number of good and efficient men without cause. He has put men on the police force in violation of the rules for their appointment. He has permitted gambling and poliey playing to flourish in the city contrary to law.

Indianapolis, March 8, 1900.

HARRY J. MILLIGAN.

After the foregoing report was made, Mayor Taggart had prepared and given to the newspapers an interview which contained a large mass of irrevelent matter in the nature of personal abuse of your committee, and it contained little else.

The interview did point out one error in the report; it was a trivial mistake as to a name and it does not lessen the force of the incident as an illustration of the use of the police department for private ends and personal favorites.

The Mayor says:

The utter ignorance of Mr. Milligan as to the subject about which he is making a report is illustrated in his statement concerning the "Kissel case," which, he says, was tried at Lebanon, and at which the policemen are said to have testified. The Kissel case was heard at Noblesville and no policemen testified in the case at all.

This accurate and truthful gentleman evidently refers to the Tron case, which was tried at Lebanon, at which some policemen were witnesses. But he did not care to mention the Tron case as the correct one, for that would not consist with another part of his story that Tron opposed Taggart's re-election and that in return Taggart closed Tron's pool-room. In order to make a show of consistency, he deliberately placed the Kissel case at Lebanon and ignored the fact that Tron had a case at all.

Mr. Taggart is right in one minor particular. The ease at Lebanon was nominally against Tron, but the real party in interest was the Terre Haute Brewing Company, a very active member of the beer trust and a prime favorite with the Taggart administration and the owner of "Fairbank." Fairbank is a beer garden adjoining the Kissel place. The suit was brought by citizens living and owning property near Fairbank, alleging that the place was eondueted in a disorderly manner. William Tron was superintendent merely and the paper defendant, but the Brewing Company was the interested party and it was eondueting the defense.

When this ease came on for trial, the names of a large number of officers and men were read out at poliee roll eall and they were ordered to report at the Union Station, where they would be provided with tickets to go to Lebanon to testify in the Fairbank ease. They were, at the same time, publicly and officially told that "these people have been good friends to us, and now we must stand by them."

Mayor Taggart is entitled to the correecton as to the name of the law suit and it is made.

Mayor Taggart speaking further, says:

I repeat that gambling has been driven from the public places and is carried on, if at all, in private and secluded rooms. * * * Indianapolis is one of the best governed cities in the Union. It is freer from vice and crime than any other city of its size * * * one word more

on the subject of gambling. Mr. Milligan has declared that games of all kinds are in progress * * * let him be subpoenaed next Monday morning before the grand jury. If he knows as to the truth of these charges, let indictments be returned. If he does not know, let him stand forth as a slanderer of the city in which he lives.

These are the words of the Mayor. Here are the facts as they are: Since March 10, and within two weeks after these words were spoken, the grand jury, without the aid or suggestion of your committee, has returned 318 indictments for gambling and policy playing. Within this period one man has been shot and killed by highwaymen on one of the principal and central streets of the city. Barn burning is so common that it excites little attention.

The following item appeared in the *Sunday Journal* of March 19:

Captain John Fanning, of Truck 5, West Indianapolis, has been suspended on charges of intoxication and conduct unbecoming a fireman. It is alleged that at the Cones factory fire the other night, Assistant Chief Ernst found Fanning in an intoxicated condition and suspended him. Fanning, it is claimed, abused Ernst and then went to his company's fire house. Chief Barrett, accompanied by Chairman Roth, of the Board of Safety, and Mr. McMillan, of the Board, visited Fanning and suspended him. Fanning became very abusive toward Roth and told the latter he would be on the fire force when Roth was shoveling coal. Fanning's record shows he has been dismissed from the department for intoxication, but was reinstated, it is said, through a pull. Other firemen claim that Fanning has been guilty of gross misconduct, but his pull kept him in the department.

This is the record made and being made from day to day by Mayor Taggart. It is Mayor Taggart who is injuring the City of Indianapolis. He, it is, who has taken the highest office in the gift of the people of Indianapolis and has debased it for private ends. He can not hide behind the city so that the shafts aimed at him will strike, not him, but it. It is the Mayor of Indianapolis and not another who is responsible for the dark record, only a small part of which is given in this report. He will be judged by his record, not by his high sounding and misleading declarations.

HARRY J. MILLIGAN.

March 24, 1900.

Indiana Civil Service Reform Association.

DOCUMENT NO. 7.

REPORT OF THE SPECIAL COMMITTEE APPOINTED BY THE PRESIDENT OF THE INDIANA CIVIL SERVICE REFORM ASSOCIATION TO EXAMINE AND REPORT UPON THE FACTS CONCERNING THE FILLING OF CERTAIN POSITIONS IN THE INDIAN- APOLIS POSTOFFICE.

To the Executive Committee of the Indiana Civil Service Reform Association :

Some weeks since, the public press of Indianapolis contained statements that the positions of Auditor, Cashier and Bookkeeper in the Indianapolis Postoffice were filled by the appointments of favorites of the United States Senators from Indiana and the Representative from the Seventh Indiana District. It was further charged that these positions were created for the friends of the Senators and the Representative, and in addition that a Private Secretary was appointed for the Postmaster, though there was no need of such an officer nor had the Postmaster asked for a Private Secretary.

After examination, the following facts were ascertained :

1. FRANK J. RICHMANN, Senator Fairbanks's Private Secretary, was named by this Senator two years ago as Cashier. The appointment was made without a request from Postmaster Hess for such an officer. The salary is \$2,200, which is \$200 more than that of the Assistant Postmaster. His duties consist mainly of work formerly performed by the Assistant Postmaster. The salary is out of proportion to the work done when compared with that of the Assistant Postmaster, and the injustice is manifest. The position is not in the classified service. The place has been used to reward a party worker out of the public funds.
2. JOSEPH E. HASKELL was appointed as Auditor by request of Representative Overstreet, about two years ago, without request from Postmaster Hess for such an employee. He draws \$1,200 a year, and is not in the classified service. So far as known, he had no experience as auditor, and his work in that capacity occupies not more than one-sixth of his time. Five days in the week, four and one-half hours a day, he does work belonging to employees in the classified service. This appointment was made to reward party and personal service.
3. GEORGE J. LANGSDALE, the father-in-law of Senator Beveridge, was appointed to the postal service in Porto Rieo on April 15, 1899, without examination, on the "temporary" plan. He was transferred to a clerkship in the Money Order bureau at the New York Postoffice on July 2, 1900. He was placed in the New York office, and in the classified service without exam-

ination. In New York he received a salary of \$1,200. On February 10, 1901, he was appointed bookkeeper at the Indianapolis Postoffice at a salary of \$1,700. He is not a trained accountant; there is no work for him to do. He is sixty-two years old and in poor health. He is thus, at the behest of Senator Beveridge, kept at the public expense, while experienced men are held back.

4. CHARLES N. ELLIOTT, Secretary of the Republican County Committee and an active political worker, reported for duty on or about February 10, 1901, as the Postmaster's Private Secretary. The place in this office was created, and the appointment made, at the request of Senator Beveridge. Mr. Elliott, much to his credit, declined to take the place when informed at the office that there was no need of such an employee. The Postmaster has a Clerk and Stenographer, a young woman, who is in the classified service, and receives \$700 a year.

It is well known that the Postoffice, for several years, has been in need of help in the delivery and stamp departments. Postmaster Hess asked for such help, and the public press has often told of this need under the present Postmaster. So far their requests have not been complied with, while high-salaried men have been given positions which the service did not demand. Whenever the positions of Auditor, Cashier, Bookkeeper and Private Secretary become necessary, they should be in the classified service, and thus open to experienced employees. At present such employees are not anxious to hold these positions, since they may be removed at the behest of the politicians. If said positions are to be appointive, then the Postmaster, who is responsible for the management of the office, should name the occupants. It cannot be said that, because they are, in a measure, positions of trust, therefore they should be outside of the classified service. If these are offices of trust, so much the more should experienced men hold them. There would be an incentive to work up to such positions of trust on the part of all ambitious men in the Postoffice. Merit alone would decide who should hold such positions. What else should decide? Public service demands the employment of this principle of the merit system, much more than private enterprises, positions in which are held because of proven capabilities. Thus public business is, at present, placed on a lower plane than private.

The people's business should be conducted on the highest plane, regardless of party and personal service to the politicians.

DEMARCHUS C. BROWN,

INDIANAPOLIS, INDIANA, March 2, 1901.

Special Committee.

INDIANAPOLIS, INDIANA, March 4, 1901.

To the Honorable William McKinley, President of the United States :

By direction of the Executive Committee of the Indiana Civil Service Reform Association I herewith transmit to you the report of the special committee appointed to seek information regarding the filling of certain positions in the Indianapolis Postoffice. The Executive Committee submits for your consideration the following conclusions :

1. That the duties which would naturally pertain to the positions in question are not beyond the reach of a good percentage of the two hundred employees of the office and if such positions were to be established common fairness required that these employees be allowed to compete for them.
2. That the manner in which the four appointments concerned were made was not for the good of the service nor did it even regard the boasted doctrine that the head of an office should choose his subordinates for whom he is responsible; but it was an adroit method of evading the civil service law and wronging the men who have obtained subordinate positions under it.
3. The fact that in three of the positions, Auditor, Private Secretary and Bookkeeper, the duties indicated by the titles cannot be found for the appointees to perform, proves that whoever was concerned in these appointments, had no regard for the public service.
4. That the necessity of the fourth position, Cashier, is at least doubtful, the duties having before been performed acceptably by the Assistant Postmaster. To assign part of his duties to a new man at a higher salary is *prima facie* evidence that the good of the service is disregarded.
5. That there were no duties whatever for the Private Secretary appointed at a salary of \$1,200. The fact that the appointee had the manliness to recognize that the duties of that place were already efficiently performed by a young woman stenographer and typewriter acting under the civil service law at a salary of \$700, and that he therefore refused to insist upon his place, entitles him to the thanks of the public.
6. That for a Senator to have his father-in-law, sixty-two years of age and in bad health, appointed, without competition, to a place in the postal service in Porto Rico, and then have him transferred to New York, and then to this Postoffice as a member of the classified service, is a maneuver to undermine the civil service law and it is helping to load the service with useless timber and it should everywhere arouse indignation.
7. That the recommendation of Senators and Representatives of men for appointments is almost universally selfish, misleading, unreliable and vicious. That in effect it usurps the duties which the President, as chief of the civil service, is sworn to perform. That the whole system should be broken up. That all legislative servants of the people should be made to depend, for their positions, upon their ability and efficiency as legislators and should be cut off from maintaining themselves by quartering their political dependents and relatives upon the public service.
8. That the power to cut off Senators and Representatives from meddling with the civil service is in the hands of the President; and if he fails to exercise that power, he so far fails in the duties which the Constitution requires him to perform.

Very respectfully,

LUCIUS B. SWIFT,
President Indiana Civil Service Reform Association.

LBAP '13



LIBRARY OF CONGRESS



0 028 001 788 7